

1/15/69

Dear Gary,

Your letter and memo of 1/12 arrived today. I am in accord with your analysis of "Farewell". Of those protests to you that you cite, if there any any you have not sent me, please do, to N.O. I go there Sunday a.m.

Maggie and the two Steves have met many of these people involved, in Europe. When I raised the Topaz question, Maggie seemed to recall the name Vésjoly (Voh- zhollee, first two syllabys slurred together, accent on 1st). One of my French friends confirms he is the Topaz guy, says his name is de Vos- joly. He seems to recall a long story about him in LIFE. If this is the case, then there would be pictures which, I think, Maggie and Burton might want to examine. I am confident there was much publicity not only at the time Topaz appeared but in separate news stories much later. Her I think the Times index would reveal.

LOOK, I think, condensed Topaz. I know one of the magazines did, for I read it. In fact, on a hunch it would fit TIGER when I can return to it, I saved that and the subsequent news stories and now cannot locate them. I have asked Burton, who has a perfect cover as a journalism major, to write the publishers for the puffery. He, like you, is busy in school. It may take him some time before he can.

My purpose in going into this is to ask if one of your friends, perhaps the law-school student who now has a slight familiarity and interest, could research this at the library. If he finds anything, it would be good to get Xeroxes, especially of the pictures, if any.

If the people in California have time to look into this, I am certain they also will send copies, for they are aware of the mistrial possibilities. The man to whom you are to send the documents when you can has been briefed. I have a letter from him today saying he "will make some efforts through my sources in Europe to see what can be found out". If I get any meaningful information from him, I will let you know.

Sincerely,

Harold Weisberg

CC: Ivon, Maggie

Paul

Jan. 12, 1969

Dear Harold,

Enclosed is the memo you asked for.

I will try to find the stuff and try to find time to copy it for Rothermel. I will try to get to the Thornley stuff--I ~~have~~ not forgotten but haven't had any spare time which has happened.

If the Archives had informed me I would have sent a check. I did, in fact, recently send a check for \$20.

The point with the Bolden stuff is that Lane, who always mentions the spectacular stuff, mentioned nothing about Oswald blurting out "Ruby Hired me" as claimed by Turner. Therefore, if it is not in Lane's memo on Bolden (I assume it isn't since I doubt if he would have neglected to tell me due to the spectacular nature of such a claim) then Turner had to have made it up. According to Galt, Bolden claims that it was a total fabrication. What interests me is that, if he didn't tell it to Lane, then we can accept what Galt says. (I have total confidence in him anyway.) It would then be almost impossible for him to have said this to Bud and suggest strongly that Bud lied to help protect Turner. This would be a crucial thing to prove.

Sprague worries me more and more.

I've got to go. I mailed the memo to Lou Ivon just in case you are down there when this arrives.

Take care and best of luck.

Gay

P.S. I sent a copy of this memo to Lou Ivon for you.

Patsy will have the photos on Wednesday. He's exhausted & trying hard to keep up w/ his extra job, which will hopefully enable them to buy a house. They aren't in great financial shape and have a baby on the way.

Memorandum

1/12/69

"Farewell America"

To: Harold Weisberg  
Vince Salandria

From: Gary Schoener

I have never seen this flick nor have I met Steve Jaffe or LaMarre, so this memo is constructed from material received from other persons.

Before any theorizing is done concerning "Farewell America," it is important to realize that both Turner and Boxley vouched for it, and Boxley allegedly told Jim Garrison that this was how an intelligence agency would make contact, thereby lending an air of validity to the whole thing. This alone, in my mind, is enough to indicate the likelihood that, no matter what the source of the film and its purpose, it is potentially destructive as far as we are concerned. Thus, even if it does originate from French intelligence, or some other source, I would assume that the CIA is quite well aware of it and has decided that it can be used to hurt those investigating the assassination.

A second major point to be considered is that, to my knowledge, these alleged French Intelligence people, who claimed to have infiltrated the plot, did nothing to stop the assassination and have provided nothing new in the way of evidence. The latter is a particularly crucial point, if it is correct, since had they really infiltrated the plot and were they really anxious to help, they should be engaged in helping us solve the case both through specific information and leads, and evidence. The fact that whoever infiltrated the plot for them might not want to ever testify in no way explains why they can't furnish specific details. Making unsupported charges against high officials scarcely constitutes any sort of help at all. Furthermore, it dilutes the case against the CIA and military by bringing in the Dallas police, Johnson, etc.

Since I have not seen the film or read the book, I will make only a few comments on the material that is presented. According to Dick Sprague, the French utilized women to infiltrate the plot. Now, while this would make a good spy novel and could be true, it is important to note that this is the same line used by David Kruman, who in my mind is clearly in the employ of one of our opposition. His girl, Dolores Salzberger, was supposed to have seduced an SS agent in Dallas to get important information. [While Dolores is not unattractive (I finally got to meet her), she is anything but a Mata Hari.] This proves nothing but is worthy of note. I have already sounded off about unsupported charges against high officials. This is always dangerous, unless you have a very strong case, since it puts you in the role of a Joe McCarthy and in addition, you can always be challenged to provide proof of your claims. Ironically, from what I have heard, the book and movie are actually quite deficient so far as the actual details of the assassination.

Other material of interest which appears in the flick, uncredited, is that of Dave Lifton and Fred Newcomb. Both have complained to me about this. The question to be answered here is how the "French" got that material. Neither Fred nor Dave were contacted. There is an easy source in Turner, or perhaps Jaffe, of course.

The material of the critics which was chosen from all of that available for the film is of a sensational variety, but may provide many red herrings. The pictures of the tramps is one good example...another one of Turner's babies. Furthermore, according to Fred Newcomb, they bring in certain things which we have known to be untrue for quite some time, such as the "man shooting" on the Nix film. Also, according to Fred, they present the material on the guy who may have a "walkie talkie" standing on the northwest corner of Elm at Houston (Altgen's photo) as fact, not speculation. From what I have heard I would conclude that the makers of the film gathered together all of the sensational stuff, no matter how speculative, and put it together in a film.

In the film are still photos of those responsible for the assassination. These include J. Edgar Hoover, Chief Curry, Clay Shaw, David Ferris, Eugene Bradley, Guy Bannister, and an unidentified individual who Jaffe told Fred Newcomb was William McDuff. This is the dead giveaway in all likelihood, of the film's purpose. First of all, I doubt if Hoover was involved, but in any event, he is the guy who people who are suspected agents, such as Lulu Belle Holmes (aka Rita Rollens when she went to see Vinca) always accuse. It is noteworthy that such accusations against Hoover are accompanied by no mention of the CIA as a guilty party, as is apparently suggested by Farewell America. Dave Ferris was thrown in because we pretty well know he was involved and he has publicly been identified with the conspiracy. I have no opinions on Curry, although he has been a frequent scapegoat, and I doubt if he was involved. Besides allowing him the opportunity to sue, his inclusion might insure that he won't give us any help at some future date, as some of us have hoped for some time. I have no thoughts on Guy Bannister other than that he could have been involved. Clay Shaw's inclusion, a necessity for Garrison to buy the flick, will provide a means for Shaw to sue and gain enormous publicity, especially since the flick is going around just prior to the trial. Bradley was likewise necessary for acceptance by Garrison and the same reasoning applies to him as to Shaw. I see no reason to assume that McDuff could have been involved or that he even knew any of the people who we think were involved in some way. This seems to be a big red herring and potentially another lawsuit. In Bradley's case, by the way, the photo of the tramps was shown. As far as I am concerned the man in the photo is clearly not Bradley. It is worthy of note that if Roger Cragg's story is correct, he couldn't be. Shaw, obviously, now has an iron clad case for a mistrial.

As a final note on the material in the film it is important to realize that according to those who have seen it, much evidence which would have been devastating to the government was omitted, such as Fred Newcomb's work on 133A and 133B. Here again we find the same pattern among those who, in the past, we have considered to be possibly government agents. Interestingly enough, the film not only uses much of what Turner decided to use in Ramparts (in lieu of more important evidence) but presents it in a similar style.

The Zapruder film which is included has four possible sources:

1. Zapruder himself,
2. Life,
3. Government,
4. Theft from one of the first three.

Sources 3 and 4 could be from either domestic or foreign intelligence agencies. In regard to source 4, it is worthy of note that Tink Thompson has been rumored to have a copy of the film (which I doubt) and definitely has a set of slides of the frames which he took late ~~###~~ one night up in the Time-Life Bldg. I have no idea as to the quality of these slides, but since he took them himself, they are probably not too good. Obviously, it would be possible to piece together a film from such a collection of slides, although it would require quite a bit of work.

Having no other evidence I would immediately assume the source to be the government, with the next likely source being theft of the film by a part of the government which does not have a copy. It is not clear whether the CIA, for instance, actually got a copy. All we know is that they borrowed the FBI's. Although unlikely, prostitution on the part of Life or Zapruder is also possible. If someone can examine the film it should be possible to determine whether or not it is Life's version. According to Fred Newcomb's description of the film in a memo of Dec. 16, 1968: "The general color of the film was very poor, in fact it appeared as if it were closer to black and white than color." If this is correct, barring poor photographic work, it would seem likely that the source of the film is either Tink Thompson's slides or a copy made by the CIA. Either of these would explain the poor quality, since in either case the copies could be expected to be the poorest of any in existence...in the case of the CIA because of generation number, and in the case of Thompson, due to poor equipment and method of copying. In this regard it would be important to obtain the opinions of Ray Marcus and other critics who have seen the Archives copy and who saw Farewell America on 12/13/68 at 9255 Sunset Boulevard at 4:30 PM.

I agree with Weisberg's memo on James Hepburn; Herve Lamarre; Phillippe; Topax of 1/9/69 in general, but have some other points to make. Harold is correct in pointing out how strange it is that LaMarre, et. al. are being allowed to get away with their strange doings. Even if these people are French and acting for the French, it is likely that they are serving the government's ends against us. I advise against any speculation concerning Phillippe or others mentioned as helping with the book. First of all, we have no way of knowing whether or not they really did help with the book, and secondly, in the case of the Americans all we have is first names. (By the way, Bud has already said that the Bernard and ~~Paul~~ mentioned are not he and his wife.) Much time can be consumed in such pursuits, and seeing how this whole thing has already led to incredible expenditure of much time and money, we should devote our time to things which are more productive.

As for the purpose of the book and movie, especially the movie, besides the waste of time and money and presentation of many red herrings, this will provide the grounds for extensive legal action and publicity unfavorable to Jim Garrison from countless places if it can be linked to Jim. Here the key is Jaffe who helped with the film, inserted the work of some of the critics in it, etc. All of the time Jaffe was on Jim's payroll, and it is noteworthy that LaMarre didn't want Jaffe to give up his DA's card and it had to be taken from him. According to Vince, it was LaMarre who ordered the cab driver to drive on when they were accosted outside of the office and surrender of the card was demanded. This alone will be sufficient to hang Garrison. But bigger trouble is possible. A recent letter from Dave Lipton laid out an elaborate theory of how Jim was behind this film and had supplied them with the Zapruder film to have a copy made. This type of a frameup is quite simple and its possibility is underlined by the fact that Dave, an anti-Garrison critic, thought of such a theory almost immediately. The theory is too long to be recounted here but includes such things as an explanation of Jaffe's trip to Europe on the grounds that the film couldn't be copied in this country. Naturally, the only reply to this threat would be through an examination of the film so as to determine which version of the Zapruder film is in it. I would like to suspend judgment on Jaffe for the time being.

Recommendation: Immediate public dissociation of Jim and the critics from the film. Attempt to get a copy of the film from Jaffe. Get the tapes of the sound track and the interrogation of Jaffe on the West Coast from Ray Marcus who made them. Investigation of all associates of LaMarre and the Canadian publisher. Request of all critics for memos on the film, LaMarre, and Jaffe.