

1/14/69

Dear Steve,

Before anything else, let me tell you we did insure the package that didn't reach you, in about March, and I have taken it up with the Post Office. If it does not now turn up on a tracing, or if it turns up damaged, we will be repaid.

Your letter of 1/12 and enclosure are important, as I will explain. But first I tell you I intended being neither insulting nor patronizing. I told you what I thought you should be told. I took the time hoping you would or at least might benefit from it, assuming part of the responsibility myself, as I should have, for I did err in judgement, and I'm not kissing your ass over it. Get that supersensitivity stuff out and act your maturity, not your years. You are unusually well, endowed for your chronological years, but you still have had just so much experience in life. Some of the things you have and have not done are not easily explained this way, but I am neither vindictive in telling you this nor just picking on you. Example: the arrangements you didn't make for me before I went out last time. I went there for no selfish purpose, without possibility of it, and at with what for me are great costs in time and money. Example, the fiasco at Santa Barbara, of which the account I have had since my return are not consistent with what you told me. Let us drop this childishness and proceed with what might be constructive in purpose and possibly in end.

Your people have still not told me everything possible on Hapburn. I learned from Ray, by phone, of the Jaffe discussions. As I asked Maggie, I should have all of this. It is now too late, and there is much too much I will not be able to get done that is essential before I have to go to N.O., now scheduled for first Sunday morning flight. Anything else you send me, please to Louis, no drop, at the office. There is now no time for the indirection which, in any event, is not necessary. I will be busy from mid-day Thursday through Friday with Moume, who is awaiting the pic-X-rays case in D.C.

Lemarre-SF: Does this indicate to you he returned to the US or that he didn't leave? Do you see significance if it is a return, after the preludes to his departure, which - have reason to believe was before he had expected, unless it was to be in France for Mass? Hoch has been silent, so I assume he has nothing on this.

Rose's mistrust could be genuine or a common ploy, I do not know which and I do continue my mistrust of him for the reasons already given. The best that can be said is that he was a disaster. I still see that memo. Louis told me he would tell you to send it. To N.O. c/o him now. He sure had a hell of a lot to do with the Frenchman he now does not trust.

Vosjoly is the name I could not recall. Thanks to Maggie!

Here is the \$5.00 you asked for. What is it for?

Thanks, but I have the NYTmas 1/1 piece on "Farewell".

Briefly, on Pelser: I loaned him a copy of the Alysia film many months ago. He has had a chain of excuses for not returning it. He has been living beyond the potential income of his writing. Example: he spent more on fare alone on one trip than the gross maximum income of his "Confidential" pieces, for their top is \$200.00. Even with other uses, if there is any value to his time, that, on this one foray, which also served to introduce him, took more than he could expect, and these are but part of his costs. In New Orleans, he asked that modest quarters be arranged for him, and they were. He immediately moved into swank ones and then started spending money on expensive extra furnishings. This could not be justified on the

advance on a book on Banister, which is what he told me he was there for. Then he decided to move there, to remain in N.O. (He seems to have left very quietly). He worked with Barbara Reid, at Moo's request, and with Boxley. As he and Boxley were reconstructing Nancy Perrin's career in New Orleans they made the grossest possible errors, leaving out what was inconsistent with their preconception. When Barbara asked about this, she was told to forget it, that it made no difference. They then told the office she was an agent for the other side. Now Joel first raised an entirely different and superficially credible Nancy story with me. He suddenly abandoned it, knowing I also was working on it kept very secret from me that he and Boxley (and Turner) were working on it. There is more of this I will not go into now.

When I finally learned the incredible thing they were manufacturing and had sold Jim on, I asked him about it over the phone. He invited me to his home. Without prior announcement of it I took Fensterwald along. There is a witness to this. After three hours what it boils down to is that they had nothing he would, as a cub reporter, dare give a city editor, leave alone as an investigator give a public official. None of it sticks up from what he told me, and this also he acknowledged. The airtight alibis mean nothing because "active" is against fact! Nancy shifted from a murderer to a "conspirator" in the murder. There are things that might have meaning, like a telegram sent "Eunice" (Eddie Brawner, but that was withheld from the office. The things Penn specifies also are missing from the files and no one has ever heard of them. These are the things that jeopardize their creation. They led witnesses into identifying Bradley, as they say, as having been in New Orleans at a time he was known to have been out of the country. They led witnesses into (or so they said-the witnesses dispute it to "ou and Moo) that there was "engineering equipment" in an apartment (of which the entire account is fiction). When they led them into identifying this "engineering equipment" as "communications equipment". It was empty beer-cans and cigarette butts. They never checked the available records (Louis checked this out himself) and misrepresented those they pretended to have checked. Example, a loud cleaver in the form of a question about the delay in getting Perrin to the hospital. They simply omitted the known ~~the~~ existing records. How he was where you'd expect him to be, in the emergency room, and give as the time he reached the hospital the time he reached the ward. This ought to be enough. But I tell you what you might guess, and if you do you are to share it with none but Reggie, and then in strictest confidence: I connect him with a man of great current interest to me, a man I regard as having very seriously hurt us. A man you both have met, not one of us. I cannot, by this medium or any other at this point, tell you more. It is not mistrust of you. "ouis knows. Joel acknowledge that if they were wrong, it would or could ruin everything, that his case did not hang, but he insisted merely that it was right. It is simply that Perrin did not die, a seaman was substituted and that Perrin, who had been a writer (he could barely write his name) became one of the assassins on the knoll. No time for more.

Jaffe's memo (please try and get him to give me everything. If anything is sent to Louis now it will have no meaning, for he has no time to be interested in anything but the preparation of the max case in chief, the prosecution case.):

Item c could, in itself, be a vital part of a move for a mistrial. They produce Steve's letter saying "our of ice" and thereby tie Garrison directly with the things said in the movie. This would be much stronger than the credit line.

Their use of the Couderc firm in New York ends any possibility of JFK sympathy or any kind of progressive or even liberal leanings. I know that firm from way back, as the representative of the pro-Nazi French. Its member, Frederick R. Couderc, was a very reactionary Congressman from NYC's silk-stocking district. It is my recollection they were Vichy-French... Please send anything else you recall or can get. Gotte get to N.O, work. Sincerely,

1/14/68

Mr. Paul Rothermel
Sunt Oil Co.,
1401 Elm St.,
Dallas, Texas

Dear Paul,

A bit more on Lemarre-"Farewell America":

Swiss front, at address I've already given you, 18 Cours des
Missions, Geneva, Frontiers Writings.

Lemarre has used cover name Marie Kerve, Paris phone, 670-0200.

Phillippe (Phillips). Was /et Vajely the name of the former French
intelligence chief or at least an agent in US? Would a picture of him be
obtainable? I could then show it to those who not others than Lemarre, the
only one I know I've met. Other Phillippe: Gerintes, 50 Rue Chaptal, Lovell's
SH, France. In 68 early August 1968, October 1968, French agent named Phillippe
Kouillon said to have been arrested in Montreal for stirring up French Canadians.

Soroguerre's office 24 Ave. Kléber, Paris, has third man, 6'5", large
frame, 200 lbs., 45 years, dark hair and complexion. Mergot 6'5", slightly built,
brown hair, eyes, thin, long face, high forehead, prominent temples, sallow
complexion, talks little, no humor or charm, sour personality. Office plush,
tastefully 18th century decor. Another of Orkney upstairs there.

Late July or early August 1968, Lemarre told someone to leave word for
him at Couvert law firm in New York, and in leaving word, to use only his first
name. It is my recollection this firm has connections from the pre-World-War II
era that is interesting. It should I have said "clients"?

Sincerely,

Harold Weisberg

12 January 1969

Dear Harold,

Your recent letter had a lot of things I did not understand what I was saying. How can you criticize that which ostensibly exists but which you haven't seen? Are we all to second-guess everyone else's work, whether we have seen it or not?

Maggie now recalls Lamarre saying that James Hepburn would be revealed at a dinner in Moscow in February.

Lamarre was in San Francisco two weeks ago. I asked Paul Hoch to send details to you and I. Rose called me today and said that he was approached by Lamarre and asked to work for him. Rose doesn't trust the Frenchman and thinks he may be working for our opposition. He's consulting with Iven on what to do. Left the door open. I don't think there is but as some think.

Maggie recalls a Time Mag article listing one Philippe Vosjoly as a French agent in the U.S. A Jaffe memo (enclosed) sent to my by the office by mistake, indicates the last name is Gerintes. News article in October mentioned a French agent was arrested in Manitoba for stirring up the French Canadiens - named Philippe Rosillion.

I further recall that when I was in Soroquere's office with Lamarre, a third man was there. He was not introduced to me. He was about 6'2" tall, 200 lbs., very large frame, about 45 years, dark hair and complexion. Maggie says it is not Bergot.

Maggie says Bergot is 5'5" tall, slight build, brown hair and eyes, thin, long face with high forehead and prominent temples, sallow complexion talks little, no humor or charm, dower personality.

Soroquere's office was a fairly plush affair, shared with another attorney, somewhat concealed in the rear of 34 Ave. Kleber upstairs. Furnishing was 18th Century in good taste. I don't know who has the other office.

I'll try to check French Who's Who this week. Will send you copy of French edition (return \$5 if you can, if not forget it).

Your letter employs offensive words that far exaggerate the situation. I have never asked, and have never expected, you to do anything. Don't begin with that sort of thing. If my mistakes are really as serious as the words you choose indicate, you have no choice but to have nothing further to do with me. If you choose to continue but continue to use such inaccurate and insulting language, I will take the initiative myself.

School is begun and harder now. I still get tired too easily and can't function more than 8-10 hours. Rose memo may be delayed.

Sincerely yours,

Steven
Steven J. Burton

P.S.
Maggie has N.Y. Times article on Hepburn if you don't have it. Please trust me and, without questions, send info. on Joel Palmer. You are the first to cast doubt on him.

SR