

To Jim Garrison from Harold Weisberg 3/17/68

Manuel Gil

You may recall that Manuel is one of the two who had made and not kept appointments with me on my previous trips here. I phoned him after my arrival and left word that I'd like to see him. He phoned me about 7 p.m. 3/12/68, when I was dining. I spoke to him from the motel house phone.

He complained that he was fied by Schwegemann's because his name appears in a "controversial" book. I suggested that with the book virtually suppressed in New Orleans this seems hardly the real reason (I might presume without mentioning one!).

Masferrer, he insists, is not MIRR and never was. He pretend s to quote FBI reports on this. I told him that within reason I would supply him with free copies of any FBI or Secret Service reports he wants, relating to him, if he identifies them to me. He has not since accepted thos offer.

He made reference to having copies of the propaganda distrib uted the night before by Bringuier, saying, as I recall, that he got the junk from Quiroga. I told him it was false, irrational and immaterial and that it had nothing to do with any complaint he might have.

I told him he could talk to me or not, as he saw fit, but that I would not permit him to waste more time for me. If he decided he wanted to, he was to leave word at the motel and I'd phone him. He hasn't and I didn't then expect him to, particularly after I saw Bartes, who I then decided was by this group considered the toughest of their number and the one they selected to feel me out or size me up.

He asked if my interviewing him would eliminate your interes t and I replied that I could not say that, that I would, if he desired report what he told me to you but that I could not speak for you. I refused to make any such offer or to go out of my way to imply it. I explained why I could not make it and why if I did it would have no meaning. Assuming as I did that he might be bugging me, at this point, I was very pointed in emphasising that each of us is independent of the other and that neither speaks for the other or necessarily agrees with the other on all points.

He seems to have a fixation about misunderstanding or mispre - resenting what I said about INCA and the Oswald tape. It was frust - rating trying to make him understand and futile to try, but I did.

Regardless of what position he may or may not have in this story, what education or background he may have, he is as reasonable and coherent as Bringuier at his worst, only quieter.