

24 Jan 69

Harold:

Please excuse my haste.

My translation of the ~~dedication~~ expression of thanks at the end of L'Amerique Brule is as follows:

The editor expresses his gratitude to those who have facilitated ~~his~~ the researches, collaborated in the writing, brought their support, and made possible the long and difficult realization of this book.

He especially thanks:

In the United States; Pat, Ann, Bernard, and Mary-Ann
In France: Charles Lasquier, Marcel Soroquère, Roland de Vassal,
Erwan Bergot, Pierre, and Philippe.
In Belgium: André Gérard
In the German Federal (Republic): Peter Boenish
In Switzerland: Jean Schneuring and André Wanner
In England: Diane Keys

and René Lamarre

Dawnay will seek French contacts to find out about the Frenchmen, and he himself will check on the Englishwoman.

I must stop. Good luck.

Dick

Bernabei

P.S. If possible, please send me (or give me references and tell me where I can get) copies of all FBI reports of interviews with JERRY A. HERALD. He says he was interviewed several times and told them all he had found. I would like Herald to see the reports and comment on them.

When I receive this material, I'll remit 10¢ per page of what I receive — more than 10¢ if it is requested.

1/29/69

Thanks also for 1/15 w label. That is possible two ways: accident and someone inside p.c. Suggest unless we find other cases, accident.

Note drop.

Sign: stress is in film, not sign. Purpose replacing sign prevent accurate reconstruction, not hide hit. No sign vibration in Z film. Nor of hole unless at late shot, which is not likely for other reasons.

Should be home February. No plans return trial N.O. Only emergency will take me. Work here much more important. Clark made a major blunder in his "panel report". It destroys everything. Eyes shot top head, there is metal thorax, etc., and other unexplaineds. I've a 30,000 word analysis on paper, as I think I said.

Hurriedly, HHI

TARA EDITIONS LTD.

63 DE BRESOLES, MONTREAL 126, P.O., CANADA

Mr. Richard Bernabei,
Queens' University,
KINGSTON, ontario.

Received 13 Jan. 1969
RS

15 January 69

Dear Harold:

I received Farewell America a few days ago. The press of other matters kept me from reading it immediately, but by now I have finished it, and I am convinced that you are right in thinking that the book is a put-on. It is immensely padded with a lot of interesting but irrelevant material. The part dealing ~~with~~ specifically with the assassination is brief, consisting mostly of undocumented assertions and an uninformed rehash of stuff that has already been published. Even that is not done well. Hepburn seems to want to put the blame on the dead (Oswald, Ruby, Ferrie, Banister, Ward, et al) or the near-dead (Hunt), or the expendable (Cohn). The CIA was very gently rapped-- involvement acknowledged only as much as absolutely necessary.

The best that you can say of it is that it was written by a hack who knows the subject poorly-- or knows it all too well, and disguises his knowledge poorly.

He avoids asking the most important questions: Did Oswald do any of the shooting? (I think that if "they" are going to let us have a conspiracy, they will require that we keep Oswald as one of the riflemen; otherwise they cannot explain the existence of all that manufactured evidence) What was the role of J.D. Tippit? (Frankly, I think Tippit will prove to be a major key in the solution to this. That is only a guess, of course, based mostly on the ~~xxx~~ pains that the Commission took to conceal knowledge of his background. They never even give his full name, which is in itself a minor, though suggestive, revelation. I understand that J.D. stands for Jefferson Davis!)

If I had read the book without receiving Sprague's information, I think that I would have immediately rejected it as the work of an ill-informed hack. If I had read it in the light of Sprague's information; I think that I would have been terribly confused by it. But in the light of your warning, it is clear enough that the piece is not nearly what Sprague thinks it is.

I noticed a few demonstrable errors of substance, although the general blundering of the book is most conspicuous for what it omits: e.g., a footnote explaining that CIA man Gary Underhill ~~xxx~~ told friends that he knew who killed JFK, and that subsequently Underhill himself was killed. That's fine, but the rest of what Penn Jones says about Underhill's remarks is missing-- that the murder was arranged by a group within the CIA. The footnote derives from Jones' account, without attribution. I am not entirely certain that no shots ~~xxx~~ were fired from "Oswald's" window, although the Dillard photo makes me lean strongly that way. I am ~~fairly~~ ^{almost} certain, however, that the business about the Stemmons Freeway Sign being removed because it was pierced by a bullet is not true. Some of the newspapers that I have on microfilm show that sign in place during the few days after the assassination. Unless it was replaced, and not merely removed, they took a dangerously long time to get around to it.

There are other things, too, although I have not gone over the account in great detail.

According to Hepburn, the only hero among the critics of the WR is Mark Lane; all the rest, all the rest, are hacks. Christ Almighty!

I think that the version that was published in Bild am Sonntag differs in some perhaps important respects from the English. I shall try to get hold of it and make a comparison; it might reveal something about what they are up to.

* I don't see how this is possible. The sign in the newspaper photos is identical to the one that was there on 22 November, and there would not have been time to manufacture a new sign exactly like the old. The sign was in its proper place

Enclosed is the addressing lable on the package that contained the book. It is a minor puzzlement in itself, for the stamps are not cancelled, and bear no evidence that it passed throught the mail from Montreal to Kingston. The rest of the package had no marks on it. I called the posting office here at the University to learn if perhaps the package had been delivered ~~xxxxxxx~~ by hand rather than received with the incomming mail, but no one there was able to remember; the quantity of mail that they receive is quite large, and no one would have taken notice.

On the lable I have written the date when I received it.

Anyway, I stand four square with you in your attitude toward this monster (I don't know what else to call it). I can well understand why Salandria blew up over it; that was, as you say, an unfortunate response, but perfectly human. Nevertheless, I assure you that I shall not loose my head over it if Lamarre contacts me. I'll continue to treat the matter as though I were willing to believe the story about French intelligence that Sprague gave me.

It occurred to me that if you ever desired to ~~XXXXXX~~ mail me anything that you are afraid might be intercepted, I should give you a "safe" alternate address. I feel somewhat awkward acting like Superagent, but occasionally these matters seem to require it, and that may be especially necessary if the Cubans get around to passing us information, for I am sure that Bretón will want to keep his involvement very, very quiet.

So if you want to send me material surruptitiously, use this address:

Mr. Gerry Tulchinsky
78 Regent Street
Kingston, Ontario

Gerry is a trusted friend, though not a "buff", and he will immediately let me know if he receives stuff for me. ~~xxxxx~~ Insert an envelope within an envelope, and indicate ⁱⁿ that the inserted material ^{is} for me. Gerry will not open it. _{that it}

Today I again wrote to Bretón and asked whether I could reasonably expect their help. I don't know what is going on up there; it may be that he is waiting for word from his government. Even that information would satisfy me, for I am getting impatient.

I hope that my brother's background and hostility toward Castro does not unfavorably influence their decision. I thought it best to be perfectly candid about that, for now they might co-operate. If I had lied about Tony, or failed to mention his association with Cuba, and they found out on their own (as they surely would, with a bare minimum of checking), then definitely we would not get their help. I am sure that I did right in that regard.

If Bretón wants more than my word that I do not intend to cause his government to suffer detriment, then I am stuck, for I have nothing ~~XXXXXXXXXX~~ more to give him. Well, lets see how it works with what he already has, and not make up problems before they occur. This path is already immensely crowded with them.

Still,
Wick
Bernabei