

1/3/69

Dear Steve,

Have you ever notice the abuse an old cat, even a tomcat, will take from a rebunctious kitten? If the tomcat doesn't, quite literally, kill the kitten directly there is almost no limit to the punishment he'll thereafter accept. So it is with people. Those who are older tend to be tolerant of those younger who they like. We accept from youth what we would not from our peers.

You made mistakes. A certain amount of the responsibility is mine, for I was aware that you were making mistakes, at least in part. Knowing this, I faced a decision: lean on you or not. Now one of the things in my mind would not likely have been in the mind of one of your age. You were in my mind, the kind of man you will yet become, because you are not yet as mature as you will be, are still in the formative years, despite your maturity, which is beyond that of most of your peers. What this means, very simply, is that you must make a certain amount of your own mistakes. This is an indispensable part of life, learning, maturing, growing.

My own judgement was deficient, not about you. I underestimated that of which Jim was capable, and you have an idea of my concept of his capabilities! I seriously underestimated this, not just by a little. Ditto for Boxley and Turner. I never realized they could and largely did make him their creature, nor, despite the low opinion of his integrity, did I really fathom Turner's incompetence and irresponsibility - and in using these words I am leaning over very far backward to be fair.

I was aware that there was such a thing as "The Plot" in February, and I then had misgivings. Everything I learned of it thereafter strengthened these misgivings, but in every case I learn afterward, not before, anything happened. When finally I could try and undoe the inherent harm or should I say recapture some of what it might cost, I did move rapidly. We may yet get some good of it, in one form or another. I cannot yet say or predict. I think perhaps we already have, and I cannot explain. It has, however, been the means of opening certain closed doors, establishing what may yet be a good and an entirely new relationship with those with whom, without it, establishing any kind of rapport would at best have been difficult. I was your years in the days of the "united front" in Europe. For a while it worked. Now we need all the allies we can get.

So, I can, to a large degree, go along without serious criticism or disagreement when I read your letter Of 12/30/68. There are some things not in it on which I will here comment ("it's for your own good!"), and some in it. You admit having misgivings as far back as 2/18/68. But you never acted or thought in these terms, carefully hid this from me when we discussed my misgivings and those many relevant things, and still, blindly, failed to exercise independent judgement, considering yourself, as you phrase it a junior member of the team, yours not to question why, etc. This is the attitude of the Judenrat, and I hope this will be the only time in your life it is yours. As recently as this last trip, I did not argue with you when you did ~~it~~ just this, in fact, in the face of it interposed your judgement and blocked certain things I wanted to do about which, because I did trust and depend upon you, I wrote you long in advance. Again, I want you to grow, if it means making your own mistakes. As recently as then you had faith in the Hepburn ploy. But because you did suspect things were not as they should have been, your course of action and thinking were wrong. From that moment on, intellectually you have no defense in claiming to be but a junior member of the team. May I add, like those very loyal Custer scouts?

I suggest you think this through for yourself, for, as you have heard me say, the Warren Commission had no monopoly on error. Let us grant them a monopoly on wrong motive. If you find, on really facing this, that you were wrong, you will be better able to live with it now than later, assuming as I do that your motive was a good one. You can now look at all those older and draw comfort. But if you Jaffe with it now, in a few years you will have a nagging conscience, perhaps sooner, with the potential of the coming trial in New Orleans (There is a non-office report there will be further delay because Percy Foreman is about to assume the defense). What you tell me is not important; what you tell yourself is. You are now old enough, experienced enough to make and stand by the consequences of your own decisions and judgements. These will not be the first wrong ones you make. But do not repeat the same kind, for this means abdication.

When I was out there this last time you were both irresponsible and less than honest. I do not know why. I assume this is not the "real you", for I know it is not as I have known you. You did not do the things you said you had, you did not do the things you could have done you were anything but organization- or team-minded. You, like all of us, have problems. At your age I can anticipate a few not as common among older people. That whole Santa Barbara business was an inexcusable mess. I would like you to straighten it out with them, even if I am never out there again. I say this not by way of complaint, for that would serve no purpose. I report it as the basis for self-analysis. It requires no comment. None of the foregoing does. I take this time I do not have in your interest alone. I hope you can understand and believe this, for in all other respects it is too late to have meaning.

Back to Hepburn: Can you make me a photocopy of the credits, etc., of the French edition? Can you give any meaning to any of the names? In it and others, like Edwin Bergot? I realize this may not be possible, but I think it important not to overlook anything.

On your friend in France, the answer is a very positive yes with a very big "IF". Only if it presents no jeopardy to him. This can be important. We must be as prepared to the degree we can for whatever can eventuate. This means we must know as much as we can, try and analyze its meaning, and then, if necessary and possible, do what we can. Perhaps during the trial. I have no reason not to believe this is a CIA department of disinformation job, if not for other reason because of their Shaw connection. It may seem unlikely, but I can not isolate anything more likely with the unlimited funds available and used on this, and with the self-defeating attitudes, which are not those of the usual self-seeking publisher. Please be alert to indications of this.

Gotta get back to other work. Please send me rifle, complete with all the clips and what ammo there is, especially if it is disarmed, to me c/o him so it can be available there for use in the trial if necessary or before it if desirable. Best regards to everyone, and thanks for what you have done and are doing. If you want to send Louis copies, I think it is a good idea.

Sincerely,

Harold Weisberg.

If you have not heard from him, he did approve the Rose memo. It may be necessary. I am convinced it is very, very desirable. Also, if there are any picture he may need on this you haven't sent Gary, please do it, asking him to return what you want returned. He has other sources than the girls and is a very solid guy.

30 December 1968

Dear Harold,

Yours of the 26th just arrived. I have not yet received word from Louie but will call him tomorrow morning, if the office is opened.

I understand your observations on the non-New Orleans stuff and the yes-man problem well. Any differences we may have had are a result of our differing conceptions of the roles of each of us. Naturally, my role is quite different from yours, and this leads to differing actions.

I must be more specific, I know.

I have looked upon myself as a junior investigator, so to speak. I see myself as part of a team. I am somewhat humble because I fully realize what my inexperience means.

On the other hand, you were among the first to become really active in this thing. That makes you very much a senior member of the team. You have the experience to analyse what I can only report.

So, consequently, I have confined my activities to reporting whatever I can that I know. Each memo contains a subjective analysis, but I have always felt that Ivon, Garrison, Alcock, etc. were in a far better position to do a really meaningful analysis. If for no other reason than that they knew much evidence that I did not.

As for Rose, Bradley, etc., I did not see it as my position in the investigation to pronounce judgment. My job was to report what I knew, offer my opinions, and allow the others to make the judgments. And I can truthfully say that what I have personally known of Rose and Bradley led me to believe that other evidence would make them good aspects of the investigation. Should I have demanded a complete copy of the Bradley file before I consented to do anything on that case? I think not. The best that I could do was to take that which I had personal knowledge of, offer my honest opinions, do the best work I could, and rely upon the other's experience and belief in truth to come to the correct conclusion. That is teamwork, I think.

So I have always said that what I know of the Bradley case I believe to be solid. It is not sufficient to convict, by any means. I have to rely upon the other members of the team for the rest and presume that they are as cautious as I.

On the other hand, you have a much broader view of the whole thing. If you have seen the files while in New Orleans, you are in a position to make an evaluation and judgement, though the jury makes the final one. I think this difference in conception of roles is a good part of our differences.

Now, the question obviously arises, what if the rest of the team cannot be relied upon? What if they are wrong? I had thought of this possibility many months ago, probably when I met Roger Craig and had doubts about his credibility and more than just doubts about his publicity tours. I was concerned on February 18, 1967 about the possibility that Jim was wrong and would pull all of us down with him. I concluded at that time that (Roger Craig in L.A. Feb. '68) that, if Jim were wrong, there was first of all no way I could dissociate Lane, you, Sahl, and the other influentials from the investigation. I have no influence. I did not know that he was wrong, so I wouldn't have done this if I could. All that I could do, I thought, was to be sure that whatever work I was involved in was 100% accurate.

When re-organizing my files last week, I had a chance to review my work. I believe that it is close to 100% accurate -- meaning an accurate reflection of what someone said, not what is true. My subjective analyses turned out to be more accurate than I would have expected. Sure, I made mistakes -- I should have realized what Broshears was the first time I saw him, not the second. Then I should have not been as lenient with him. I should not have relied upon the assurances of an irresponsible and unreliable person as Jaffe, e.g. with Hepburn. But, then, how could I have knocked what I hadn't seen? *Can I agree with it either,*

Are all members of the team supposed to second guess all other members of the team? No. only a few senior members, in positions of access, can do that.

I have very few regrets over the work I have done. I have spent exactly \$15.00 of Jim's money (for Bradley photos). It is disappointing that I have found nothing to use in court, though.

Regarding Rose, I will talk to Louie in the morning. Let me say that your suspicions of Rose in Feb. were more than justified. I told him recently, when he called to tell me about Boxley, that everyone had suspicions of him then and he said that he would have been appalled if they hadn't. I felt that after his testing period working with Jaffe, Turner, Boxley, and Garrison that he would be considered o.k. by the team and only objectionable actions in the future would raise the questions. I do not know what he has done in major part since he went to NOLA in late March. Now, I think, look at who passed the judgment of him.

I'm writing poorly, I know. Had a bad reaction to shots today. Sorry.

Your upset over Jaffe's use of Jim's money is more than o.k. I expressed my concern to Louie months ago, as did Rose.

I agree with your philosophy of agent charges. It is irrelevant. The only question is does someone help or hurt? Irresponsibility can be as dangerous as an agent.

You are now more explicit on what you want on Hepburn. Addenda to memos enclosed.

One other thing. I do agree that Jim should have stuck to NOLA and not gone elsewhere. Always, the Shaw case is the decisive one. But, once he made the decision to go elsewhere, and I'm in a position to help, I will. Even if just to establish what isn't.

Atkins

Harold —

If you want, I
have a personal friend
in Paris - well placed -
who can try to find out
who some of the people
are. I don't want
to involve him unless it is
necessary. Let me know,

Steve

ADDENDUM MEMORANDUM

30 December 1968

RE: JAMES HEPBURN, ETC.

BY: STEVEN J. BURTON

To my knowledge, LAMARRE saw the following persons when stated:

STEVE JAFFE, mid-May to July 1.	}	in Paris
BENSKY of Ramparts early Sept.?		
BURTON, end of July		
MARGIE FIELD, early Sept.		

JAFFE, in August in Los Angeles and Las Vegas

JAFFE, early December in New Orleans, New York, and Los Angeles
MAGGIE FIELD, early December in L.A.

Persons involved in the production of the HEPBURN junk are:

HERVE LAMARRE, variously known as a French agent, economist, and lawyer. He is about 5'11", 155 lbs, dark hair and eyes, 32 years old but looks younger. Speaks with thick French accent.

MAITRE MARCEL SOROQUERE, a lawyer at 34 Ave. Kleber, Paris. He is about 6'1", 35 years old, dark hair, 160 lbs., very clean cut and suave.

ERWIN BERGOT, a contact man for Lamarre in Paris.

The following credits appear in the back of the French edition of "L'Amerique Brule":

In the United States, PAT, ANN, BERNARD, & MARY-ANN
 In France, CHARLES LASQUIER, MARCEL SOROQUERE, ROLAND DE VASSAL, ERWAN BERGOT, PIERRE, & PHILIPPE.
 In Belgium, ANDEE GERARD
 In Germany, PETER BOENISH
 In Switzerland, JEAN SCHNEURING & ANDRE WANNER
 In England, DIANE KEYS
 and RENE LAMARRE.

Jaffe also mentioned seeing an unnamed bigwig at INTERPOL and PHILIPPE (LNU), ostensibly the former head of French Intelligence in the U.S.

s. AB

M E M O R A N D U M

30 December 1968

TO: HAROLD WEISBERG
FROM: STEVEN J. BURTON
SUBJECT: JAMES HEPBURN, ETC.
SOURCE: MAGGIE FIELD.

On December 26, 1968 I interviewed MAGGIE FIELD at her home regarding her personal knowledge of the JAMES HEPBURN episodes.

by whom
MAGGIE was given the name of ERWAN BERGOT to contact HERVE LAMARRE when she went to Paris in early September. When she arrived at her hotel, she left a message for LAMARRE to call her. When she returned later in the evening, messages awaited her from LAMARRE and STEVE JAFFE. She phoned JAFFE first and he said that he had left no such message. To this day, she does not know who phoned her and used JAFFE'S name.

The next afternoon, she and JOE FIELD, III met with LAMARRE for drinks. She said that LAMARRE'S attitude was very superior. He spoke disapprovingly of GARRISON'S investigation, questioning his use of such "kids" as JAFFE and BURTON and an association with a "bearded hippie" such as BENSKY. He thought that not much would come of the investigation and said that Garrison should "take" the Zapruder film from Life and show it all over the country. He seemed contemptuous of all efforts by the American critics to expose the truth. He showed no interest in MAGGIE or the work she had done.

JOE, III was preparing a paper on the French generals attempted coup and LAMARRE spoke of this for a time. He knew some of the generals and arranged for JOE to interview some of them.

LAMARRE wanted to see MAGGIE again and, although she didn't want to because there seemed no point to it, MAGGIE saw him for drinks. This time, ERWAN BERGOT accompanied him and they took MAGGIE and JOE, III to "Lasserre", one of the finest and most expensive restaurants in Paris. The Red Carpet was rolled out as MAGGIE had never seen it before and she still wonders why, since she is not a tourist and has been to "Lasserre" before. They talked very little, if any, about the case. LAMARRE did suggest that Maggie do a new book composed of a daily comparison of the activities of DE MOHRFENSHILDT and LEE OSWALD from October, 1962, to the assassination!

During all the talk, LAMARRE never revealed any evidence at all. MAGGIE'S subjective impression is that LAMARRE is interesting, has a sharp mind, is a nervous wreck, impolite, no humor.

A footnote in the English version of FAREWELL AMERICA highly commends MAGGIE for her book and contains inaccuracies. E.g., MAGGIE has not been to every publisher in the U.S. She is upset by such high praise when he has not seen the book.

Following the screening on December 13, LAMARRE was invited to the Field home so that JOE, JR. could offer his opinions. LAMARRE behaved very impolitely and left without much respect in the Field home.

s. *B*