

NEW ADDRESS: Rt. 2, Frederick, Md. 21701:::301/473-2198

1/22/68

Dear Mrs. Hartman,

Thanks very much for the letter and the transcript of the Thornley interview. It is helpful, I think valuable, and I have a call in to Garrison to see if he wants a copy if he does not have the tape. Incidentally, if you could make a copy of the tape for me I'd appreciate it. Or, if you cannot, if you can lend it to me long enough for me to make a dub, I'd appreciate it. There is much that can come from an inflection (some of which you indicated). I can also make a dub for Garrison if you cannot. I think he'll want it if he doesn't have it.

I know of no index but Sylvia's, and it is out of print.

I know little of Lincoln Lawrence. The whole thing is a gimmick. Your opinion is mine. It is fakery and I think you give the answer why.

John Rene Beindell was not abused. Thornley's problem is that he is not as bright or as all-knowing as he thinks he is. He may know fact that he doesn't understand, as with Oswald's security clearance. He made no mention of this.

I did get to read the transcript before tonight's show, and that is helpful. Again, many thanks. Please excuse the haste.

Sincerely,

4666 - 27th Ave. No.
St, Petersburg, Florida 33713
17 January 1968

Mr. Harold Weisberg
Route #7
Frederick, Maryland 21701

Dear Mr. Weisberg:

Thank you for taking the time to reply to my previous letter. I did not expect an answer so it was a nice Christmas present. I will write more on the content in another letter but time does not permit at this time.

Enclosed is a rough - very rough - transcript of a TV interview with Kerry W. Thornley this past Sunday, the 14th. I think it may be of interest to you and Mr. Garrison for a number of quite obvious reasons aside from the possibility that you will receive questions about him on the radio the 22nd.

On Page 8, he was asked about any contact that would tend to discourage him from cooperating with Mr. Garrison. His response to that, telling about "a reporter from Washington", impresses me as that of a man who is either somewhat naive or very prudent. His reaction seems to indicate that the caller was successful.

The Monday before Christmas the postman delivered to me two boxes and a package: All 27 volumes of whatever you wish to call it from the Warren Commission, a gift from a friend. What a hoax! Every spare moment has been spent since then in goggle-eyed disbelief, reading and making notes - and in great frustration because there is no useful index to the ~~evidence~~ exhibits.

Do you know of any published index? The one produced by Sylvia Meagher is out of print. I do hate to take precious time to make an index and cross-index if it is possible to take advantage of someone else's work.

Who is Lincoln Lawrence? I heard him one night on a northern radio station and almost thought I could identify the voice but, unfortunately, conditions were such that the station kept fading away and I could not hear enough of it to be positive. His book is one of those suspected of having been subsidized by some agency of the government, as I wrote in my first letter - writing of the probability of some books being subsidized. In his case, it would have been ^{become} he presented such a far-out theory that all other critics would be made to appear ridiculous as well.

You will note that, in the enclosed transcript, Mr. Thornley's answers begin with every "uh" he uttered. I had to cut those out - and his replies were replete with "uh" upon "uh" - when I realized they would double the length of the copy.

The copy I enclose is the first carbon. The original is not so easy to read since I badly need a new typewriter ribbon. I have the tape if it is of any value to you.

My best to you and Mr. Garrison. I wish I could do more to help.

Sincerely,



Helen G. Hartmann

Encl.

NEW ADDRESS: Rt 7, Frederick, Md. 21701

12/23/67

Dear Mrs. Hartmann,

Your letter of 12/16 is one of a number of (to me) rather nice Xmas presents. I do appreciate your taking the time to write as you did. The stack of unanswered mail (I have just returned from N.O. - I stayed there and worked for Jim after the broadcast) requires brevity of me.

That my first two books angered you pleases me. I want Americans to be angry, as I am. I feel that if we are not we are inhuman. I abhor the emotional castration demanded by the eastern intellectual community, one of the reasons they do not review my books and do what they can to help suppress them.

Your suggestion about Thompson fascinates me, for it exactly coincides with my belief. I realize you are circumlocutious in your letter for a purpose and I respect that, whatever it is. I also detect what I think is your suggestion that I believe you have a background or experiences that qualify you to hold an opinion in this field, unless I am too sensitive and read in what you do not ~~mean~~ intend.

I was in California when the SEPost came out. From the promotion and the words of friends working in the field I knew that the best he had done was to rehash the work of others, probably largely mine. Not until 11/21, flying home, did I get a chance to read the Post summary (I have since begun the book, squeezing a few minutes in on it between essentials). My suspicions are confirmed in it. Stripped of the flackery and pretense, what Thompson does is to tell the government, which cannot any longer pretend the report is accurate, that there is a small error it can acknowledge and live with while still claiming the essence of the Report is accurate! He is in accord with all its basic ~~assessments~~ ^{assessments}, even on the lack of a conspiracy. He says the three assassins he alleges were not conspirators! That, when he also uses the word, "accomplice" is rewriting the dictionary and the law.

He is in accord on the sixth-floor window, on Oswald, on the fatal shot coming from there, on Frame 210, etc. What he does is say that there were two other kooks who got the same nutty idea at the same time and just by accident selected the same place and the same time for its implementation - just by accident - no conspiracy.

There are a few things in his stuff not yet published. The remarkable thing is that each one I have thus far seen (or heard him mention) is in my completed but unpublished work, things I told colleagues working in the field (at least three of whom have been in touch with Thompson) in confidence, so that understanding what I had learned would help their work. More remarkably still, I have yet to see anything he has "discovered" that I hadn't. Is it conceivable that in those 300 cubic feet of files I had gotten everything of value, so he could get nothing I hadn't? Not to me!

And his error is conscious and basic. He can make some through ignorance, but not the kind he made. These are deliberate and consistent with your analysis and mine.

You misunderstood something I said. I do not have a letter from Hoover. I am qualified to work in the Archives, as any citizen can be if he has the need.

The truth is Mr. Hoover does not answer my letters. He will not even send me a press release! He is silent to my specific charges of specific suppression and to documentation of their illegality.

The books are going separately. Thank you for the order.

To answer your questions:

Marina was an early orphan. She was a member of the Young Communist group, the Komsomol, not the Communist Party.

Oswald was a metal-worker in a radio-TV factory at Minsk. There is absolutely nothing to indicate, even justify the suspicion, that he got intelligence training inside the Soviet Union. However, he was in such a part of the Marine Corps, a U-2 outfit and he had a crypto clearance!

At least one of the wire services did distribute the pictures taken from inside the sewer when Garrison released them. The papers just did not carry them. This is not unique. UPI asked me to write a special article to be used the Sunday before the anniversary of the assassination. I did. They put it on the wire. I have not heard of a single paper using it!

There were all sorts of rumors, as was inevitable. That LBJ also was shot was false.

The claims that O shot at Gen W is Marina's alone. It is without substantiation and I do not believe it. When it was possible to tie this bullet to O by spectrographic analysis, this was not done. I presumed because it was known it would not succeed. There is no ballistics tie.

I suspect most people would be willing to believe that a wife would not squeal on her husband, hence that Marina didn't report on O.

RFK, like most other busy men, knows what his advisers tell him. He has every reason to trust them, as he did when he was AG. They are merely wrong, and they have a vested interest in seeing that he is misinformed, as they also did in the DJ. This does not make him a conspirator. However, I think his conduct with the pictures and X-rays said to have been those of the autopsy cannot be explained or excused.

I am not a left-winger or a right-winger, and I agree that neither would make any difference. On some issues I am liberal, on others conservative. In truth I am uncompromising on this issue.

The tests made with this rifle, and by experts, which O was not, prove the contrary to the Commission's allegations on both speed and accuracy.

The information on Oswald and the car is from Rath Peine, his instructor.

The general route of the motorcade was announced less than a week in advance. There is nothing but confusion about its path at Dealey Plaza. However, in general, this is the usual route for such motorcades in Dallas.

Please excuse the haste. Merry Christmas to you, and let us hope we get this mess straightened out in the coming year.

Sincerely,

Harold Stebbins

4666 - 27th Ave. No.
St. Petersburg, Florida 33713
16 December 1967

Mr. Harold Weisberg
Route #7
Frederick, Maryland

Dear Mr. Weisberg:

There is really no adequate way to express my gratitude for all of the effort and valuable time you have expended in order to bring us some realization of the enormity of what has been done in the case of the assassination of President Kennedy. I include your wife in my thanks since I know all too well what a wife endures when her husband is driving himself as you so obviously have done - and are still doing.

For some years I have given all my attention, every minute I could spare from being a housewife and a moderate amount of money to a different line of research and study. In April or May of this year I received the first of several communications suggesting that I compare our findings with some of the analyses of the Warren Commission Report. This had to do with the manner in which various government agencies had handled - or mishandled - investigations of our subject and their ridiculous and, far too often, completely false conclusions.

As with so many others in my field, I was increasingly disturbed by the attitude of "The Establishment" and the attempt to sell the public a point of view that was in direct opposition to the truth.

To reassure you, this has nothing whatsoever to do with any political philosophy. Nor is any religious belief or disbelief involved. We do, however, feel that what we are trying to accomplish is every bit as important, in a very different way, as what you are doing. I merely want to explain this so you will know I am not a professional patriot. I do love my country but see no purpose to carrying a soapbox and making a career of faultfinding.

Like the average person, I had accepted the Report and had been so busy I had not looked below the surface. Our newspapers followed the suit of the others and proclaimed that now all was well since the assassin had been identified. My first reaction to even a hint that the Report was wrong was quite violent. Never was anyone so sure of anything as I was that there could not possibly be a parallel to the situations we had discovered - at least, not in one lifetime.

Finally, a friend put three one-dollar bills on the table and stipulated that they were to furnish myself with the October "Playboy" to learn the truth about Jim Garrison, "Whitewash" and "Whitewash II" by a man named Harold Weisberg. He said he had read all the books on the subject and that yours are, in his opinion, the most credible. You are welcome.

I read and I became angry; I read more and became more angry and quite distressed that such an outrage had taken place. This was the reaction

my colleagues had expected. They also knew I could not sit quietly and wait for others to do something. So I took the action they knew I would take.

It is my opinion that Bob Ruark of WLCY radio is one of the most important individuals in this area of Florida and I also believe he is completely unaware of that importance. I hope he considers me one of his friends.

After a few days' thought, I called in one night with a suggestion that the listeners read the "Playboy" interview with Jim Garrison. This call was met with a diatribe from the same caller who has been so bitter in his questions to you. So I called another night with a little more on it. These calls coincided with the news releases about Josiah Thompson. Bob, in response to a question from some caller, said that perhaps he would try to get Dr. Thompson as a guest some night if there was enough interest. This was what I had been waiting for and hoping would happen.

The next day I phoned Bob and told him it was my feeling that, whatever Dr. Thompson might have written, it would almost certainly be what you had already covered and in more detail in your two books. The rest you know.

Dr. Thompson raised numerous questions in my mind. I have better than the average knowledge of the methods used by the intelligence community of this country and how it reacts when it discovers what may be only a small thing, but a thing that might erupt and reveal what has been withheld from the public, a suppression for which there is too often no justification beyond protecting our government from the anger of the citizens of this country, not because of any foreign power. Usually the foreign powers have acquired this information and only the U.S. citizen is kept ignorant - "for his own good".

I am aware of books written with the connivance of one or more representatives of a group or agency upon which an "attack" is ostensibly being made in the books. You have seen this done regarding the assassination. We have found this tactic all too familiar in our field. We further have sound reason for suspecting that some of these books are published and well publicized through the dubious courtesy of subsidies from some agency in our government.

So, I distrusted Dr. Thompson. It is true that if he arrived at his conclusions the way he claimed then this tended to back your contentions. But. He seemed to have had access to evidence and testimony that even the Warren Commission found was withheld from it. One thing was what he claimed to have learned was shown in the autopsy photographs. This is something that was not available even to the Warren Commission.

I take it for granted that all purchasers of the complete set of 27 volumes are carefully entered on a record for future reference. And I wonder about the kind and degree of attention they may receive if they make too many waves. We shall see. To my knowledge, there is but one set in St. Petersburg at this time and the owner is known to me.

If the callers to WLCY radio seem a little unreasonable in their skepticism sometimes, please bear with them. All of us here have been sheltered from such unpleasantness as this with which we are now faced. They hate to be

forced to consider that there is something else that is just as dangerous to our way of life as extreme right or left wings. This is why Bob Ruark is so important. He makes it possible for us to question so many in various other fields and thereby become better informed and, we hope, better citizens.

The program remains on the air for another hour after the guest has left and numerous questions have been raised that you did not hear. I will put them on another page so that, if you choose, perhaps you can cover them at the beginning when you are next our guest.

You mentioned a letter from Mr. Hoover giving you permission to examine certain evidence and testimony and, if I recall correctly, asking for cooperation with you by whoever is in charge of the archives. If Bob Ruark does not have a copy of this letter, perhaps you could arrange to send him a copy. He would use it to your advantage.

Incidentally, Bob has never, to my knowledge, recommended the purchase of any book on his programs until he suggested that listeners provide themselves with yours.

I mentioned the parallel in the treatment of the assassination and that of another kind of investigation. There are so many instances that are beyond even the wildest coincidence. If I had not been prepared by my own research in the other field, I would have found it hard to accept the fact that our government has the degree of disrespect for the office of President of the United States and the utter disregard for the life of a lesser citizen that has been evidenced.

From past experience with Congressional investigations into things concerned with the intelligence agencies, I do not place much confidence in the outcome of another. These can be, and have been, stacked to favor any result desired. The only hope I can see is success by Jim Garrison and I sincerely wish him the very best. If he loses, the entire country will have lost.

Enclosed is a money order in the amount of \$6.50 for your last two books. I hope you receive many more orders. You have earned a great deal,

Thank you again for having worked so hard on this. It is appreciated by any who take the trouble to read what you have written.

Sincerely,

Helen G. Hartmann
(Mrs.) Helen G. Hartmann

Encl: \$6.50 M.O.

Questions asked by WLCY radio audience, St. Petersburg

1. What was the occupation of Marina's father? Was Marina a member of the Communist party?
2. Where was Oswald employed while in Russia? Did he receive any type of training there? The statements of the person asking this question implied that he was trained as a Russian agent or secret police.
3. Why weren't the photographs taken from inside the sewer distributed through the news media?
4. What about all the rumors that President Johnson had been shot in the hand?
5. What about the allegation that Oswald took a shot at Walker (Gen. Walker)?
6. If true, why didn't Marina show good faith as a resident of U.S. and turn him in?
7. If Oswald was not the assassin, do you think for one minute that Robert Kennedy would let it go as is? Does this make him part of the conspiracy?
8. Are you a left-winger - as if it is anyone's business?
9. How about the possibility that the rifle could have been fired as rapidly as would have been necessary? The tests made by experts.
10. What is your basis for stating Oswald could not park a car? Is there testimony from the driving instructor?
11. How long beforehand was it made public the motorcade would take the route it did?