

4/18/69

Dear Paul,

Today is the last of Bill's employment, so from now on my day will be less broken up, more conducive to continuous work, as in writing, where I abhor interruptions of any kind. I have spending odds and bits of time lately in trying to integrate most of the unclassified files into the primitive classification & improve on it, as well as on the file of correspondence with you and removed your name, etc, and filed them by subject. I will refer to each below. If I fail to mention any, I hope when you have time you will send me a copy of it, or them.

It is a great tragedy that we had no integrated filing system available to us, for this makes one of the major problems of retrieval of information. As time goes on and I forget more, or am unable to keep so much in mind, this becomes more acute. I am often reminded of this as I glanced through this file.

For example, a brief Belmont note on Gaudet; I had forgotten he had noted that Gaudet was the source on the Ruby painting purchase from Larry Barenstein. You have my name on my interview with Barenstein, then months ago Gardner and Moe both asked me to see Barenstein, first speaking to Pettell, who had gotten nothing from him, Tom raised as much fuss I didn't. I finally met him by accident. I wish I had been able to see him alone, someone, including strangers, was always with us. Once it was a friend of "Barnley's", who I know fairly well and do not trust, not alone for this reason. His name is Jack Barksdale.

Digressions: Barenstein was told to Trotsky's nephew and may possibly be a millionaire today. On any event, his indications are he is quite rich.

From the same source, a former Bay of Pigs prisoner who has been friendly, I learn that Gaudet has seemed to be a "Luftwrench", who folded his magazine last month. He apparently was able to get support (including financial) from Latin American governments and other sources enabling him to survive previous financial crises. (I had not known of the production of Harvey M. Weiss (Times-10/26/68) from West Point) but there are two similarly-named Gaudets in D.C. and when you see the complete version of GOOP you'll see the address of the right one. I have added much on him. There is also a second publication with the same name as his (source ibid), the second of the Citizens' Committee for a Free Cuba, Paul Bethel, editor. Formerly U.S. Embassy Havana. Further digressions: same source says Nixon's great and good friend Beta Robazo (approx) is a Cuban who fled 1958 with family from Machado, is pro-artist (strongly). Robazo lived with him briefly on return to U.S. Nixon has good connections, especially if he consults on policy!

In one of your unindexed memo's you refer to one looking Gonzalez, from "Haynes & Johnson's" book (or is it Hal's memo). This is probably Maragon, the one of interest. He gave the wrong name when captured fearing the consequences of his past of his connections. Same source, who was with him. He is full of interest, same reason.

Your 5/7/68 memo on literature distribution: par 3., there is another alternative, that it was physically impossible, as if the informant were in a car, cab or bus. I seem to recall one report in which an informant was in a bus or car. The trolley would be quite limiting, since there is but one in D.C. today, the St. Charles.

At this point, while I was changing paper, I got a phone call from Mac. In a way it is encouraging. He is going over the files, weeding out all the leads to Constantople, Bangkok and all the other things outside of N.O. He is now interested in these many leads they did not and could not follow because of all the primrose paths they tread. I suppose this means Shaw-Ferrie connections. Anyway, they are finding interesting things, some possibly wrong or unimportant (like a reference to Oswald giving out leaflets on Gravier Street).

Re. 31: It was much more than a few gambles. Jesse Gore had time to get back from wherever he was after his secretary phoned him and told him of the ricketing, and would be around for a while thereafter. He and deBruyere were friends. How you may further be aware of evidence of FBI personnel viewing of videotape.

With this was an Archives ~~xxxxx~~ reference, re Quiroga reports. May I have a copy? I think that is quite significant for a number of reasons, only one of which is that he arranged for the INGA interest. Another is the peculiar content of the cited reports, another is its out-of-character aspects, etc. I was told in N.O. that he reacted horrified when questioned there, as I recall. When the FBI went so far out of its ways to avoid giving his name or in any way identifying him, as in the Benister report (Wall), it flags our interest.

Per 34: "Another FBI informant is someone in INGA". Is this in the sense of someone regularly working with/for them or someone keeping in touch, like "utler undoubtedly would? If not him, do you know who?"

Your reference (178764) to Bartos: is it not interesting that he is not really identified? Or asked about his name in LRG's notebook when he was later reinterviewed by Wall?

12/12/67, your thoughts about the Allen-Saett Report. They undoubtedly have the Senate Internal Security, House Un-Americans and FBI among their sources. They have had SISC stuff fed them.

12/21/67, Unidentified men: Do I have your letters on this? If not, say I, please?

12/17/67, Quigley: Is it not possible strange that there is no report from him on this seemingly important thing before the end of the Commission's life? Is there something not here I do not now recall? Very odd. If you have a copy of the "sharer story, I'd like to read it carefully. I know a writer by that name. He was not unfriendly when we met. In connection with this memo, you may want to recall one I sent you after speaking to Barbara Reid about her interview with someone who knew Quigley well and a comparison between this and the report Hoxley wrote. She took him along. His was entirely inadvisable.

11/29, 81, Oswald's lit. This mistake, as I believe I once wrote you, was not likely by the Government Printing Office. I have dealt with them extensively. They take no liberties, insisted, then at least, on having everything in writing. If only the fingerprints that might have been one it, I tend to favor the view that there may have been something a little different about that particular leaflet. The GPO would not have known to wait out the thing that disclosed the switch.

2/24/67 deBruyere. Do I have a copy of that 10/25/63 report? I think not. I'd like to go over it carefully. (Collie) When you wonder about him, say I remind you (Per. 3) that he regularly attended Cuban N.O. meetings, threatened Rene after P's testimony? Was a Cuban expert, with Cuban informants? Epstein pointing out no affidavit from him? Most likely, I think, pointed out to him by Liebler. He didn't dig

If this conjecture is correct, I suggest the fact had a meaning to "labeler" other than he imparted to it.

10/29/67, Butler: May I have the Bourvins letter? That little affair may have had much more significance. If you can spare me two copies of the partial transcript, I'd like to file one with Boggs, one with Cahner. Do you have pamphlet "Oswald Speaks"? If you can send me these, too, would you please write these two names on the back, for by the time you have time, I may have forgotten my purpose.

11/24/67, Cordell - via Foundation. Overriding you say were the charges. However, there was a kind of competition and there were some personal dislikes and antagonisms. Cobb, for example, vs Brent and Shaw (and Hernandez may have been less Shaw's friend than on the surface seems to be the case). There was pressure against founding ILM in the HE, I'm told. Was the ILM accusa liberal estate only.

7/16/68, Militant and former memo. Do you have the WJ article saying there were Washington officials looking forward to a successful assassination of Castro. If not, can you copy that part of the LIFE article, please?

On another subject, Bernabei is doing excellent thinking on the rifle and ballistics. His work will soon be proven, I believe. My own rifle still does not have the right mounts because, apparently, it required a special threads for the mounting screws and the gunsmith was so determined to make it exactly the same he was reluctant to use different screws with different threads!

Sincerely,

Ulhorn International has a fascinating sound (Berrett May 3, 1968). Anything more? That El Peccerero report looks more and more interesting. I have not been able to spend the requisite time on it in N.C., but I have found a woman who was at one of the parties Oswald was supposed to have attended. She thinks he was there, and it was not far from his home. The FBI really leaned on the people who were at that one. So, they have been quiet about it, afraid. I was not alone when he arrived.