

Schwartz, Herb

XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

Rt 8, Frederick, Md. 21701

~~XXXXXX~~ 1/11/68

Dear Fred and Marlyn,

Gary Schoener (who is great) has told me of your letter of 1/7/69. You are right, and I want to comment. If you find some of my language blunt, I do not intend insult. And please excuse the ribbon.

The <sup>A1</sup> ~~news~~ film does show an officer with a pump gun.

Let me fill you in on Turner and your work on the pictures - and Lane:

You will recall that about April 18 you sent me four sets of those pictures. I got them at the Post Office, went to our local paper, called the AP in Baltimore (which has yet to return them), sent them a set, left a set at the paper for it and the FBI (which I also phoned, and it only took them two days to get the pictures, of which they have yet to comment). This was, as I recall, April 20. Then Ramparts was organizing a King Assassination Committee and asked me to serve on this. I agreed, spoke to Hensky, and offered to hold these pictures for him or to use them in a scheduled Minneapolis press conference 5/14 to attract attention to the new committee. He asked that I send them to him instead, and this I did, immediately. This, I have no doubt at all, is how Turner got them. He is an unabashed literary thief, so indiscriminate and unoriginal he purloins error. You will note that it was not until June that he used these in the SF paper. Subsequently he said he noted this personally as soon as the picture of the sketch was printed. Then it took him almost two months to do anything.

Now on June 4 I gave Mark Lane, who I regard as a very poor specimen, a three-hour TV show I had already scheduled in DC, to help him launch his second book. I had agreed to this without knowledge of its contents and basic dishonesty. He there, as he had in the book, actually stole my material, this time to my face. We had a few words about it, much on the air. He then aired what Trent had done with those same pictures. When I tried to give you credit for having done that work, having the perception the others of us didn't, he asked what difference it made. I told him it made the difference between honesty and thievery. He then, utterly without shame, embarrassment or restraint, defended thievery, saying that all that counted was the use of the material! I have this on tape, off the air and in the studio.

later  
On Rose and Turner: may I remind you that when I was there in early February I communicated my ~~xxxxxx~~ suspicions to you people and asked that a picture of Rose be taken (add McNabb to his aliases), and that instead of doing it, instead of not telling me it would not be done, instead he was told? You now have this low opinion of Liften. Remember, when he called me at your place, when he should have had no knowledge I was there, I warned you against him, told you that he had a spy inside your group, and look what you put him in a position to do to me by simply misrepresenting what you, voluntarily, gave him, knowing that he could not but misuse it? I say this not to chide you but because I am again going to ask you to do what can still be done about all of this, and to remind you that those who have a share in the creation of this bad and needless situation have a responsibility in preparing us to defend against it.

At what point does the fact that Turner never uses anything solid and always uses and passes on, persuades Garrison to use, become suspect? Is not his

record undeviating? Did he not even plant a bum rap against the FBI on Lane and the Freep, eaching its own use under his own name? I, too, do not charge he is an agent, but he could not have been an agent and been more successful, which is to say, more disastrous to the investigation. In not one case that I know of has he done the simple, basic checking, as with <sup>B</sup>radley and that picture, <sup>B</sup>radley in New Orleans, etc. He bled and milked the Garrison investigation and those helping it, keeping it always on the wrong track, always away from the essential New Orleans work, which remains undone on the eve of the trial. He also is responsible for the Lamarre fiasco, more than anyone else other than Garrison, who should have known better and paid no attention when I warned him, as I did in June, when I was there and later, in July, after reading part 3, by mail. You cannot read and believe that book! Not if you know anything about the field at all.

By the way, I would like you, in some detail, to give me a memo on what of your stuff was how used/misused by Lamarre. Also a separate one on your suspicions of Rose and what he did to assuage them. He even persuaded Jaffe when Jaffe was skeptical. This could be important, for Rose is connected with what we know he has been and with all this bad stuff and an enormous waste of time and money needed for other, viable work.

Lamarre: I really need, immediately, every scrap of information, no matter how seemingly inconsequential, about him and everything and everybody connected with him. At this point we must assume that his work, regardless of its auspices (and I have from the first believed CIA) has the potential, if not the intent, of causing a mistrial. We must therefore be prepared in the finest possible detail. I will haunt you if you do not do this, and if something like this happens, you will not be able to face yourself unless you now try. Not one of you, for example, told anyone, not even me when I spoke to some of you, that Jaffe had said (whether or not he did) he had given Lamarre the office copy of the Z film. If he did not do it and said he did it is even worse than if he did. I found out only by accident, when I phoned Ray about something else, and he had two afterthoughts and was good enough to call me back twice. I must be prepared for this when I am in New Orleans. I will go there as soon as necessary after the hearing in Washington on the subpoena for the pictures and X-rays, which is this coming Friday, in Washington. The office will not have time to pay the slightest attention to this - has not - has no one with the kind of understanding to put on it anyway. They are leaving that up to me, and to date I have had some success with the limited time I can put on it. I can now connect Lamarre with the wrong (meaning the "right") people. This is not nearly enough. I need much more on it and everything else. Including those he mentioned, those he saw, what is wrong with the film, what you people told him, what he replied, etc. Everything, Fred, please believe me. It really is urgent. There is, in my opinion, ground in that film alone for a mistrial, unless it is properly and thoroughly answered.

What Mort said about Leemans is correct and there is nothing wrong with it unless he used it before the office released it. Art Kwin should have a copy of his affidavit. He did it voluntarily and it is much stronger than you say.

Steve Burton has sent me some valuable information about Lamarre, etc. Jaffe has not responded. I depend on you to do this completely and immediately. Marilyn is pretty sharp. Please have her do the same thing, each of you separately, in case it is necessary to know the source and one recalls what the other does not.

Also, suppose Turner is an agent? This suspicion is warranted by his record. If there is anything along this line I should know so that anything that might emerge at the trial ~~can~~ can be faced, please give me that, too. I understand what you may say is not to be taken as accusation.

My best to you all - and thanks.

Sincerely,

4640 NOBLE AVENUE  
SHERMAN OAKS, CALIFORNIA  
91403

January 7, 1969

Dear Gary,

Thanks for the kind words and the check to cover costs of the slides. Also, I appreciate the slide and copies of your articles.

I'll examine the DCA slide when I get time, to see if this could be a rifle. Remember checking this some time ago and that I came to the conclusion that this officer held a pump shot gun...as did other officers that day. You may be correct, about this, but I'll try to study this some more.

Your charges, re Jaffe, Boxley, Rose, Lamarre, fit my thinking, but the Turner thing really bothers me. Met Bill only once and he impressed me as a very solid guy. Some of his writing has bothered me...especially when he used my Frenchy/Mexican sketch in the San Francisco Chronical and Ramparts, sans credit...not only that, he claimed credit.

This thing was at best highly speculative and I sent it around as so. I intended it as a possible lead and not for publication. Anyway, Bill picked it up and ran all over hell with it. So did Sprague. And to my anger this thing turned up in the film Farewell America as fact along with some other undocumented research of mine.

All we (my wife and I) have been trying to do is to share my thoughts, leads, etc. with other critics in the hope that others may add to, or subtract from my work. In other words, co-operate. As of this writing, I am somewhat saddened and somewhat embittered by all that has gone on. Yes, I know, I'm nieve.

My solid research never gets presented. Turner had the 133A and 133B stuff last summer and did nothing with it at Ramparts. That doesn't make him an agent in my eyes, just poor in judgement.

The only other time I've doubted Bill's compentance was when he tried to convince me that one of the tramps, allegedly arrested in Dealey Plaza, was Eugene Bradley. I tried to show him why this could not be true, but he seemed strangly dogmatic on this point and for no good reason. This comparison has been spread around among the critics so much that even Eugene Bradley took the thing on television and had fun with it. This did nothing but hurt Garrison. Sprague also agrees with Turner about this comparison, and this really shakes me. So, now I get your letter and don't know what to make of all this.

PAGE TWO

As long as you've cautioned me about some people, let me put someone on your "people to be wary of" list. That's Dave Lifton. He has been very mean to some friends of mine, plus vowing to get Garrison any way he can. I don't know how you feel about Jim Garrison, however, I'm not going to cooperate with anyone who intends to damage the trial in New Orleans.

I'll say that in front! Jim's all we've got...and god help us if Jim is destroyed.


Yeah, I'm biased! Okay, very well, I'm biased. Everyone has their hero - Jim's mine. If you can think of a better one, let me know.

One other thing about Turner. Sometime ago, I had grave doubts about Jim Rose, or Jim Rodes, or Vince Rose and took some stuff over to Maggie Field to talk to her about him. She also felt queezy about Rose.

Well, about two weeks later, I got a call from Turner (he's never called me before) and Bill wanted to know what I knew about Rose. I told him, it wasn't much. He then spent what I thought was an inordinate amount of time convincing me that Rose was okay. It seemed strange to me at the time...like, Bill was worried about what I thought about Rose. What the hell should he care, anyway? Who am I?

Anyway, thanks again for the prompt reply and will be in touch with you soon.

Sincerely,



FRED

FTN:mkn

P.S. Saw the Dick Cabbot Show on ABC-TV at 11 a.m. (approximately, our time) and Dick had an interview with Mort Sahl. Mort gave some new information from New Orleans about a guy who appeared on NBC show last year (the show that attacked Garrison) with Frank McGee as moderator. Anyway, Mort said one of the witnesses on that show Fred Lemans gave Garrison a deposition that he had lied on the NBC show. He lied because of government pressure from the IRS. That was good news, but you can imagine my surprise when I saw that Mort was edited, in at least two places, in the TV tape. Big brother has finally arrived.