

Comer Clark

Dear Paul,

1/31/85

Thanks for your 1/27, its enclosures and for your letter to Rose. I did not subscribe because those conjectural and theoretical scribbles do not interest me, are generally readily faulted and, because I believe those kinds of things to be counterproductive, sometimes annoying.

I've read the piece about Comer Clark and to the degree that he once was allegedly a responsible reporter I found it interesting. There is, in my view, nothing of factual nature and nothing that can give Clark's piece any credibility.

It is more complicated with Solo, but whatever he said and whenever he said it, it just isn't credible. It is that simple. The world just is not that way and there is no ruler who would have thought for a minute of maintaining silence after he got any such report.

Moreover, there is now a new and major fall in it. In his deposition in his lawsuit against Don Freed Phillips testified to having a source inside the Cuban Mexico City embassy. With such a source if anything remotely like what Solo and Comer allege, there simply is no possibility of the CIA's preserving silence about it.

The Turner trash is typically Turner, with his typical dishonesties, omissions, etc. He and Hinckle have written only in self-protection because it all started with them as they've never ever really recounted. I met Rose at that time and was immediately suspicious of him. Turner's account is hobbled to cover his and Hinckle's incredible gullibility and stupidity, they and Rose had additional roles, and even Turner's account of the movie is unfaithful. Nor does he refer to any motive behind it. The day they tried to palm it off on Garrison I met them at their hotel and provided all their transportation until they-literally-fled, except Jaffe and Lamarre (Turner doesn't even spell the name correctly.) I am the one who blew their fake, which Garrison's staff immediately interpreted as designed to get a mistrial in the Shaw case. I thought I've written about that contemporaneously and that you knew.

If Turner had any of the talents his FBI employment required other than being a crook he'd have devoted himself to trying to determine the reason for the obvious SNECE project. (He even has the original title wrong and omits that "Farewell America" was Garrison's suggested title, accepted.)

It was when Garrison's staff got concerned about the book that they existed in blowing it. Even as I recall first, then others. Garrison gave me a copy of the major part once as I was catching a plane, I read and analyzed it then and wrote as soon as I was home. It was an obvious fake and that after just looking at it Hinckle and Turner had anything to do with it discredits both.

There are minor clues to credibility I'm surprised others do not pick up. Take the Comer crap, is there any "Central American country(not a banana Republic)?" Is there such with a "ruling family?" Is there any basis for even suspected that Gilberto Alvarado "was too close to Phillips?" "Close" at all?

Have you ever wondered where SNECE really got a clear Zapruder copy? Not from the Kennedy family, as Lamarre told me. Not from LIFE, which asked a fortune. Isn't the most likely source official? and as we know and I published in the PW reprint, the CIA had a print and deceived the WC about this. Turner, Hinckle and all the others go only in the wrong direction and for the wrong reasons.

Hastily,