

Mr. Ted Gandolfo
169 Grange St.
Franklin Square, N.Y. 11010

10/9/88

Dear Ted,

In your own interest I must be blunt with you or you will make a laughingstock of yourself coast-to-coast. You hung up when I told you that the CIA's advice to HSCA* to disregard the so-called "tramp" pictures was good ~~advice~~ advice. This was when I told you that Dick Sprague made up the name "Ffrenchy" for one of the men in the pictures because ta Dick his clothes appeared to be French cut. If you dig out you old copies of Computers and Automation you'll find that Dick himself said this.

You said that there will be someone from the CIA on the WBAI radio show to be syndicated. If there is, he will know the truth and ysu will be the biggest spectacle your side of the Statue of Liberty. And, as it happens, you can check some of this with Jim Garrison, who should remember.

This is because there came a time, just before the Shaw trial began, when he had been booby-trapped by Bill Boxley, formerly CIA and named Woods. I worked like hell on it and, as his own assistant Sciambra told me for him, saved Jim from a real disaster. Part of Boxley's nonsense was these irrelevant pictures.

First of all, the men were not ~~tramps~~ tramps. That also was Dick's invention. They were winos. That they were picked up and walked past the TSED had nothing to do with the assassination and was at least an hour later. There were trespassers, found in a boxcar about three block away and the only way to walk them out was past the TSED.

Those men have been identified as just about everybody except Mohammed and a couple of his pals. All identifications were the imaginings of some so-called critic.

If I remember correctly, and Jim should, the first of these ^{of many} made-up identifications was that one of the men was Edgar Eugene Bradley, then working for the rightwing preacher based in New Jersey. I think Mark Lane made that one up.

"Frenchy" was, I think by Sprague, "identified" as LBJ's farm manager!

I could go on and on ^{but} my only purpose is to protect you from your own stubbornness and ignotance. And to keep you from making the CIA look good on a coast-to-coast hookup.

You just can't go around an accept as unquestionable truth what somebody else made up, particularly not when there is the chance that somebody who knows what the official investigations show, and there surely was one of those wild imaginings, will be in a position to dump on you like you've never imagined.

I take this time when I should have gone to bed only to save you from yourself.

Be stubborn, don't believe me, and see what happens.

And, I told you the truth about how the government works. You may not like it but it is the real world, not whatever you dream up to replace reality. If you'd ever had any experience in government, or ~~even~~ watching it carefully, what I told you would be obvious. Whether it was the right procedure for an investigating committee or not is another matter. I warned Sprague, as I told you, to steer away from that. So, you can check me by two phone calls, to Jim and to Ken Brooten, who, as I told you, phoned me after Sprague was forced off NSCA, to tell me that I was ~~Merling~~ Merling, remembering the future. Nonetheless, asking the executive agencies questions is normal and for them to reply is also normal. The replies you read me are, in fact, ~~much~~ much as you do not like them, good advice, and you'll really be clobbered if you go into the other one, too.

Even if there is nobody from the CIA on the show, if there is anyone on the other side, you'd best fear that he'll be primed.

Good luck for you'll need it!

Harold

Resumed ~~10/90~~ 10/90 First of all it is important for you to recognize that there is an enormous amount about which you know nothing or too little. This is not a put down - it is true in varying degrees of all of us. And second of all, as I've told you often enough, you cannot just assume that something somebody say is without question true. So, be safe and stick to what you know best, HSCA. There you can be safe.

You should also recognize that just because there is no reaction when you are on various talk shows that does not mean that there will never be a time when there will not be any reaction. Thus ~~thus~~ you could in the past have been wide of the mark often and stir no rebuttal or even have been informed that you were wrong. This time there is going to be so much attention that it is likely the executive agencies will monitor and have some response, direct or indirect. If they want attention they'll get it. And would you like to be held up as a horrible example, with maximum attention, for some careless error? Can't you see that anything like that, whatever it comes from, helps these agencies and hurts us?

I'm sure you never heard of what I say above about Garrison. I never talk about it and the only people who know, to the best of my knowledge, knew contemporaneously. Some heard from Roxley, who led Penn Jones to denounce me as a CIA agent for exposing him.

The only fair complaint about what you read me is against Blakey for his bad judgement. There is no legitimate complaint per se against a Congressional committee which seeks advice or information from any executive agency. Blakey, if he had been conscientious and wise, would have recognized that these agencies have much to hide and thus he should not have trusted them to be impartial or fully responsive. Blakey began with preconceptions and conducted the committee's affairs to try to support these preconceptions. That is no way to run any investigation.

If I could know in advance what would happen and warn counsel Dick Sprague, as Ken Brooten will, I'm sure, confirm, don't you think that Blakey ought also have been as careful, and cautious?

And ~~if~~ if Garrison could have been deceived and misled by one he trusted, what makes you think that you or anyone else is immune? Jim was a lot more experienced and sophisticated than you, too.

As they say in baseball, stay within yourself. This means don't great any inflated ideas about what you know and overlook what you do not know and stick to what is solid, not something you like that somebody else said.

If you want to go into the CIA, there is more than enough that is solid that is known and I think you do know. Don't go into areas where you are ignorant, such as the relations between the Congress and the executive agencies and the responsibilities of these agencies.

I repeat again, if you criticize the CIA for counselling Blakey to ignore the tramp pictures and there is anyone on the show who is at all informed, or if there is any interest by any government supporter, then or later, you'll be laughed at from coast to coast and you'll do the cause of truth great harm.