

9/25/68

Dear Dick,

Enclosed is a copy of my today's letter to Sprague.

On the Cleveland picture: I know some of the side and have to make a copy from the print I have, it would cost within reason what one from the Archives, a generation younger, would. Write them, enclosing \$1.00, give them the identification, and they'll send you or \$2.00. It will cost less than sending mine to you registered and getting it back the same way.

I've read your 9/18 carefully and, as you know, agree. On Van Der Kerr, please do what you can, for I have less time daily, there each day arising new things that should be done and others do not do. I'm also trying to get in some much needed physical exercise, which reduces the time for this work, and I'm making a conscientious effort to get some at night's sleep, for the first time in five years. I want to be better prepared for the forthcoming fall.

It is almost invariably an error to assume cooperation. This is one of our continuing problems. Some of us do this instinctively. Some never do it, as you will learn, and perhaps it is better that you learn it for yourself. For were it reported to you it might prejudice you against either the reporter or the non-cooperator. Grant Jones about CCRP, asked to read it, and has given me no wringing that he has what might be a worthwhile addition. He may just not have thought of it, however. Or, he may have plans requiring he hold it out.

Had a pleasant visit with the Det. Factors's yesterday evening and night. I'll be seeing them again soon. They are quite cooperative.

It is not necessary to destroy that I send you unless you think it advisable. I had tougher things to say, face to face, in D.C. They do not endear me but they are necessary. The fuckup there is precise and scientific. I have come to the point that I wonder about some of the people. Because of his persistent double-crossing, what cannot be accidental, I told Jim one to his face that I henceforth would not trust him. Jim was present and not happy about the event or what I disclosed to him about the operation of his office. I can add this thing, about which I also have misgivings: when they are in New Orleans and know the local situation better than anyone else, they let live things go (and you cannot imagine how live) to crap around with what is outside their jurisdiction. Now I am not suggesting they should not have interest in other things. But when they have limited finances, staff and competence, they might better concentrate on what they might do something with. Their failure to follow up what I had turned over to them in the first half of July lost them an important witness on the Shaw case. I have that person on tape, but it is not the same thing as an affidavit to them, and that person is now dead. Another "accident"! There are important Shaw things they have not even tried to check out, where I have already established the fact and developed the witnesses. Further, I made specific deals with Jim on one aspect and he without second thought violated it. I cannot make arrangements with people on a basis of their talking to me if I cannot make good on my word. Henceforth, this means that I will be more limited in what I can accomplish. In any event, I've tied Shaw in with other aspects of the assassination story.

I get the Free Press only! Someone gave me a sub. I get the N.O. papers and just forced the T-P to print a retraction on their Bringulier-suit story.

I am without confidence in Broshears and have the deepest misgivings about Jaffe havin' signed such a story. They are to make a joint public appearance. I think the effort to check the Corpus Christi thing out failed. I have no reason to trust it, either, or, to put it the opposite way, not to mistrust it.

I have the Castor's...

There are two main reasons for this.

The first reason is that the data is very noisy. The second reason is that the model is very simple.

The first reason is that the data is very noisy. The second reason is that the model is very simple.

The first reason is that the data is very noisy. The second reason is that the model is very simple.

The first reason is that the data is very noisy. The second reason is that the model is very simple.

The first reason is that the data is very noisy. The second reason is that the model is very simple.

The first reason is that the data is very noisy. The second reason is that the model is very simple.

The first reason is that the data is very noisy. The second reason is that the model is very simple.

The first reason is that the data is very noisy. The second reason is that the model is very simple.

The first reason is that the data is very noisy. The second reason is that the model is very simple.

The first reason is that the data is very noisy. The second reason is that the model is very simple.

DEPT. OF COLLEGE
QUEEN'S UNIV
KINGSTON, ONT

1

To:
Date:
Re:

QUEEN'S UNIVERSITY MEMORANDUM

18 Sept. 68

Harold:

Nichols wrote and told me that his facilities are not adequate for conducting rifle tests in the manner that I require. His range is very short and the test requires a range of at least 90 yards. He has passed the ball back to me, which is all right. I did not pursue the matter because I thought Nichols would run the test. I shall try to get a proper weapon and do the test myself. I have an excellent range and can make accurate records of trajectories. From a friend in the States I ordered a scoped "Oswald rifle" for Gary Murr, who wanted one as a souvenir. I am sure that Gary will let me run the test with it.

Until test results are available, it's best to regard the matter as speculative. I know that the trajectory is high, but I myself cannot determine whether at 90 yards the bullets would strike a few feet or a few yards high of the point of aim-- I think ~~they~~^{FLET}, but I am not sure.

I, too, would not make much of Bieberdorf failing to note that LHO was alive before he was placed in the ambulance-- anything can happen under such excitable circumstances. But it is unforgivable that B should have treated him as a dead man after he started to struggle.

I am really not too concerned about getting credit, but I appreciate it anyway. Do whatever you think is suitable; it's all right with me.

I got Van Der Kerr's thesis on interlibrary loan from the University of Indiana. Except for certain passim remarks in other portions of it, the only portion of interest to researchers is Chapter 3. I made a Xerox and sent it to Sprague because it contained useful data on photographers. I did not send you a copy because I thought Sprague would note relevant new material and would inform you. But I am beginning to realize that researchers are not in as close touch as I thought. In the future, I shall try to keep you better informed about my other contacts and what few scraps of information I pass on to them.

I shall re-order the thesis and copy relevant parts for you. If you wish, I will follow up the matter myself, but I suspect it will be more advantageous if you pursued it yourself. I suggest that you write to the University of Indiana (probably they have a Dept. of Journalism) and inquire about Van Der Kerr's whereabouts. Then get in touch with him and find out what he knows.

A reasonable compromise, and one that will take some of the less important labor off your shoulders, would be for me to locate Van Der Kerr and to tell him to get in touch with you. In fact, I think that that is what I will do. If you care to locate him yourself, you may do so in the knowledge that I, too, have undertaken the same task. But unless I hear otherwise from you, I shall not seek Van Der Kerr's information-- not because I would not be please to be in touch with him, but because I think you might wish to be in direct touch with him.

If you want me to get his information, then tell me so. Otherwise I shall only try to contact him and to get him to contact you.

The book, There Was a President, contains a few pictures that I had not seen before. They may not be relevant, but I shall describe them in an attachment to this letter. The book belongs to our library.

CORRECTION. IT WILL TAKE A WHILE TO GO THROUGH THE BOOK, SO I MAY SEND THIS LATER UNDER SEPARATE COVER.

2

I got further information from Gary regarding his and Gough's interviews about the Toronto Ray. Gary says that Toronto Ray does not match the description of London Ray. Apparently there was also some definite recognition of Sprague's "Frenchy". Most of the info is with Sprague. Gary says Sprague and Gough intend to turn over evidence to Ray's lawyer once the trial is started and they see what direction it takes. If you want information, I think Sprague is the one to see-- he seems to be playing his cards close to his chest, though, mainly in consideration of the impending trial. I am convinced that there are legitimate reasons for not discussing the matter publicly at this time.

Thanks for the advice on Dawnay and Joesten. Joesten wrote to me and asked about what I had in mind by inquiring whether Ray was the man who was arrested in London. I told him that it was pure suspicion based mainly on data available in the press. I offered to send him copies of some published material that I thought he might not have seen, and to straighten him out on some of his data.

I wrote to my brother and asked him if he would get the Cuban classbook or put me in touch with somebody who might be able to get one for me. I have not yet received a reply. After I receive his reply I will ask him about Penabaz, Bringuier, and Durate.

My own impression is that Tony knows nothing related to the assassination, although he may know some of the Cuban exiles. Even if he was not CIA, as he strongly asserts, he did know a lot of Cubans.

Don't bother to get in touch with him. Later on I will write and ask if he is willing to talk to you about Cuban matters. If you contact him I doubt whether he will tell you anything. I doubt, in fact, whether he will tell me anything. While I am in touch with him merely by letter I will pressure him as hard as I dare; if he co-operates, I'll try to get more out of him.

I, too, was attracted by the name Caster in the Frazier documents that Hoch sent me. First I thought of Col. Castorr, for apparently he was occasionally referred to as Caster. Then, of course, I thought of TSBD employee Warren Caster. I had done some work on the location of various TSBD employees at the time of the shooting, but was not interested in Caster because apparently he was in Denton, Texas, at the time. I did not search for all the references to Caster at the time, but I will do so soon and pass on anything of interest. Warren Caster lived in Dallas; Berry Caster in Irving. There is really nothing to say yet; let me check the record.

In talking about Garrison's case, I do not refer to it as the truth. I am aware that most of Garrison's public statements relate to data already made public by others; and I emphasize that the results of the Shaw trial (if it ever occurs) has no bearing on the question whether there was a conspiracy. In private I favor much of what Garrison puts forth, but in public I approach the issue with caution, for if Garrison fails to convict Shaw, surely the papers will play it as proof that there was no conspiracy-- just as they "proved" that no one was firing from the knoll by ~~showing~~ publicizing Itek's analysis of the Dix frame that appeared in Esquire. I find Garrison dismaying at times, but I am so attracted by what he is doing that I have to check my extreme enthusiasm over what he might accomplish.

Let's save discussion of this until sometime when we can speak personally. In the mean time, I'll heed your note of caution.

SINCE I DO NOT CONCEAL MY CORRESPONDENCE, I REMOVED ^{HAD DESTROYED} YOUR PARAGRAPH ON GARRISON. THANKS FOR IT, I AM NOT INTERESTED IN HEARING "GOOD" THINGS -- I JUST WANT TO KNOW THE TRUTH.

Do anything you like with any material that you get through me, provided that the stuff depends only on me. For example, the data on Toront Ray came from Gary and originated with Sprague and Couch; as far as I am concerned, they control it. But if anything develops from Dainay's inquiries about London Ray, you may do what you wish with it. Sprague seems to be the repository of Ray material, and if I get anything, I will pass it on to him-- and to you.

Sprague knows more than he has told me, but I can understand why those who have data may not wish to share it yet. What bothers me is that there may be a whole lot of data scattered in separate hands, stuff that makes no sense when viewed in pieces, but could make perfect sense when viewed together. and believe

Sprague is competent, and I hope that he will disclose his information as soon as feasible.

Besides keeping my eye out for articles in the National Enquirer, I subscribe to the L.A. Free Press and Ramparts, which occasionally publish assassination material, some of it good. If you do not get either of those, and I can send you material from them from time to time, let me know. I also get the N.O. States-Item, which I suppose you get.

L.A. Free Press printed an article in mid-August that provides a clue which may be worth tracing. Perhaps you are aware of it, but I will mention it anyway. The article treats disclosures of Rev. Raymond Broshears, roommate of Ferrie for a short time in 1965. Broshears said Ferrie confessed to his part in the plot. Assuming that B's story is genuine, two of the killers tried to fly from Dallas to Mexico in a small plane on the afternoon of the assassination, but crashed and were killed off the coast at Corpus Christi.

It would be useful check Corpus Christi or other south-Texas newspapers for the story of the crash. Even supposing that the crash took place, it still may not have been reported, however, for the assassination dominated the news. Still, if it is possible to trace the story, it might produce names.

I have good visible material for lectures and need none of your stuff. Correction-- there is one thing that I want, the FBI photo of Lovelady in the striped, short sleeved shirt; I want it in about the same size as it appears in MW 2. I cut out my copy of the picture but put it aside when I learned that L was not wearing that shirt; somehow I lost it, and it is quite important to my discussion of the Man in the Doorway. In discussing that issue previously I made the mistake of treating two important questions as though they were one: 1) Was JMO the Man in the Doorway? In discussing that, I am satisfied with the material that I have, for I can accurately describe the shirt that L actually was wearing. The more important question, however, deals with the cover-up: 2) Did the investigators believe that L was the man in the doorway? Since it was not discovered until mid-1967 that L was wearing the checkered shirt, it is clear that nobody-- FBI included-- had any warrant for believing that the Man was L.

I need the FBI photo to show what sort of evidence was available while the investigation was going on. The size of the picture I need goes with other photos that I am using.

I could kick myself for confounding those two questions, for one really does not have bearing on the other, but I was so convinced that the Man was JMO that I did not see the significance of the FBI believing that Lovelady was wearing the striped shirt. The Weigman photo of the doorway set me straight-- it leaves me with a face resembling Lovelady's and a shirt resembling Oswald's.

No matter, though, for I want now to make the distinction between what was so and what was believed.

I have started talking around Kingston and am making plans to get to other areas that I can drive to.

Concerning p. 40 of Van Der Kerr's thesis, the sentence that contains the last word on line 10 is this: "He had the same hair and jawline as well as the same clothes-- tee shirt, coat over the arm-- everything matched." This is the very thing that made me think that the picture is Altgens 5. The Man in the Doorway appeared to have a white "coat" slung over his left shoulder. That phenomenon is fairly easy to explain as an optical illusion. Standing behind the Man in the Doorway is a man in a white shirt. In the photo the white tends to dominate over darker shades and even impinges on the form of darker shapes. This is most obvious in the left cheek of the Man in the Doorway: the brightness of the white shirt cuts deeply into the cheek of the Man in the Doorway-- you can see this clearly in Josiah Thompson's blow-up of the Man's face. The Weisman pictures show that the Man had nothing over his shoulder.

It was the business about the picture not setting on the lines that made me think it was another picture than Altgens. The handwriting at the bottom of the page is irrelevant to you. It is simply a reference to WW 2 where you discuss the FBI report on ABC's Elmer Lower.

I also made marginal notes on Dawney's report of London Ray. I did not bother to "translate" them because I was not especially interested in influencing your judgment about Dawney's report.

The notes relate mostly to the possibility that the London Ray was taking narcotics. The upper note on the right margin says: "Memphis photo shows no crew cut." It refers to the photo that was distributed to the press immediately after the transfer. Below that, referring to "sun glasses", I wrote: "consistent with druggs and dilated pupils". In the left margin, referring to "dark blue eyes that appeared to have no pupils", I wrote: "if he was on dope, pupils would be dilated-- might have been all pupil". My notion was that London Ray's pupils were so dilated that the witness might have seen none of the color of the eyes, just the darkness of the dilated pupils. On the far left margin I wrote: "cleft in chin?" and "left ear sticks out?", two important descriptive points in James Earl Ray that Dawney does not cover.

~~XX
XXXXXXXXXXXX~~

I do not know the name Wally (Wiley) Yates. Since you phrase your question in that way, I presume that the name is phonetic; i.e., sounds like Yates. If you have a Dallas phone book for 1963, I suggest that you look up the name Yates; I believe that form of the name is more common than Yeates.

The wife of a colleague of mine has family in Dallas and was raised there herself. I recently asked her to get Dallas 1963 phone book for me. If she gets it, and you don't have it, I will pass it on to you. Otherwise I will keep it.

QUEEN'S UNIVERSITY MEMORANDUM

Stitt,
Pick

Re:
Date:
To:

→ I.E., DILATED PUPILS WOULD CAUSE EYES TO BE SENSITIVE TO LIGHT