

Peter Dale Scott/Jones Harris alliance; Oswald-Imposter; Robert Anson 8/1/75

Anson has a "Special to The (Sacramento) Bee" article headed "How Many Oswalds?" in the issue of May 18. He uses what he says is the material of these two, "Scott and his partner, J.G.Harris, a New Yorker..."

Although anyone could have collected the same material, this seems rather much like some work done for me by Shirley Orr. I gave it to Garrison, whence the world. Harris copied everything possible and took it with him.

There is nothing new in this piece, not remotely. Even the errors of the NYTimes Franklin piece on Hoover and the alleged withholding from the staff is repeated. Harris personally knows better from the TV shows we did together on WTTG.

What there is in this that requires Harris to have any "partner" is not visible.

There is little doubt he could have given the same material to Anson himself.

(Can this be a piece Anson did for New Times, which would not use it? It hardly pays to write such a piece for a single paper.)

Without some explanation the whole thing, especially the "partnership" seems strange.

It can be that Harris is trying to trade on Scott's name but this does not explain Scott's willingness.

Or the ethics of presenting an old theory widely considered years ago as their own and an original one.

Harris started working this "imposter" and "Warren suppressed from his staff" line in September or October 1974, according to what Franklin told me. It is a line for which the staff, obviously, has every reason to go. Thus there is the repeat from the Times that Slawson is "one of the lawyers who did not see the [sic] memorandum. Well, this was Slawson's area; there were numerous memos; Slawson, with Coleman, filed a long report including analysis of the State and other information on Oswald's foreign travels; only one was even classified (confidential); and there not only is no reason to believe any was ever withheld from the staff - there is every reason to believe none were. To have done that would have been foolishly risky. The safer course was the general practise: to work around factual and conjectural problems.

More perplexing still is the fact that this is a b.s.-rehash piece that lacks what could easily have been included to make it better, old and new stuff. It either was left out or it is being held back for other purposes for which this could be a puffing. Example: little-known material on a domestic "imposter." Hoch certainly has plenty of this and Harris knows of the other non-secret memos on this I used to his face. Bolton Ford would have been an ideal one and if Harris hadn't known it he did after seeing me use it on the TV show.

Anson seems to be tending to specializing in this field. It is possible he is selling the same conjecture/conspiratorial stories around the country.