

Paul and Gary only
N.O. parts of Kelley-SS meeting today.

3/4/70

They immediately considered that Clay Shaw might be Clay Bertrand, but never came up with any proof. They admit they could not avoid this, he was that prominent a candidate. The bureau also did. I was explicit: there is no reflection of this in the files of either, and the character of the investigation is open to question - they had not spoken to people I could refer them to.

How did they know about "Farry" so soon? "From the lawyer" Andrews?" Uh, huh, I think so", Then, perhaps he was not sure when I pressed. I made it clear that Marina was asked, in my opinion, before they knew of the arrest by JG. Not denied.

They did no investigation of him after the FBI came into that. They had done none before, despite the character of his remarks about the Pres.

They may have copied the Bringuier-Oswald ^MMarines book and if they did I'll get copies of the unannotated pages. I cited his testimony about telling them about the Mex, explained why it interests me, and they'll check

Doesn't know why they got a second copy WDSU film, doesn't know why when they had the debate they got and used the Cuban version. No investigation Gil, INCA.

They'll check to see if they know anything about the latin filming LHO on Canal just before Bringuier got there.

They also have the stories about LHO seen with a Mexican newspaperman but could go no further with it than I. They had lots of Oswald report where it could not have been.

Forgot to ask about Alba, but it is in notes I gave him.

Without identifying man, I told them of my Jones interviews and the identical identifications by him and Silvers. Offered access to tapes. Kelley seemed not surprised when I told him Jones killed in Cemille.

Aside: autographed Agnew picture, outer office. Unautographer Nixon and Agnew pictures inner office. None JFK, LBF, which, I suppose is normal.

I got the impression he was impressed with my detailed knowledge. I was not reluctant to disagree, as with Godfrey K. He said he knew that case and it had no JFK connection, I told him he had agents to both mother and wife pretty soon after ass, but had expressed no interest in him until after JG inv surfaced, when hospital was changed to locked one and treatment was changed, He seems to know about Godfrey, however.

We did not agree on Vallee, Miltner. He said not given WC because not involved. I cited others known not involved, like the man in a Mex jail, and how did they know and he knew (and he agreed) this was not the only WC function. No further, save I said I'd like to check my copy transcript against voices because there are errors. Not refused. I went into this some, without any argument: that in each case the President's plans were changed, in one cancelled, and in one there was what amounts to a blueprint of what the government says did happen.

I laid off Bringuier but made brief mention Fene (known), adding this could not have been LHO and wasn't drunk. No argument.

You both know how I work, what my objectives are, etc. I regard this as very successful, and I think there is the promise of more. I suggest you think of the possible significance of the crack they know what happened because the Bureau told them. At no point was I given to understand that they regard this as a closed matter. Nor was it made clear they do not. However, I have the feeling that their time may come when I may hear more from them about our work. This cannot happen unless they really trust me. Can you realize the potential if such an improbability came to pass? Here you see another reason why I want all this to remain confidential, not to be talked about where it might be overheard.

There were no cracks about Garrison. On the first mention I said I did not regard what he did as a N.O. investigation, hence I made my own and independent one. No further comment.

Goldonna Jack Martin: professes to have no recollection how it started. I pointed out within hours of case, Dallas office was on phone to N.O. with report.

Tarsikes: dropped it because they thought nothing to it.

Remarkable coincidences: got home to find phone not working, not dead, crossed line with a man who gave his address as Washington on a Seattle call. When I went to a neighbor's to report it, I was told it would be fixed in a.m. We have a private line, so there should be no one on it, ever.

Apparently did not know significance 544 address. Told them, not sparing FBI. However, they said they thought the FBI had made a big investigation of it, which I would presume they should have. I told them the official representation was of the opposite.

Although I tried not to, I did forget to raise a few things verbally. One is the original medical reports obtained by the SS. Another is the Geraci investigation. He recalls no Bankenderfer interview. They will look for the attachments to the Shand report. The Brennan interviews fit what they said was not related hence not given the WC. Willis, negative answers to the questions. No copies, no intelligence derived. Moorman boiled down to my asking for a chance to see the first if they copied. He remembered her and them as "showing nothing" I argued that pictures showing crown scenes cannot be so dismissed that they may have been looking for the wrong thing, that perhaps her first could have showed IHO or Lovelady. No further inv. letter from Havana which they dismissed as crack.

I guess that covers it.

It is understood that if I believe there are SS things not in the Archives, I'll ask for them.

My overall impression is of honest intent, to the degree bureaucracy permits, and a very strong desire that I not take them to court which, if nothing else, prompts them to take a nothing-to-hide posture. I think it might be unfair to suggest this alone prompts such a position. In short, by and large, I was more than favorably impressed. If I detected a few other things I've indicated, we'll have to wait and see if they are valid. In all, I'd say we now have a different relationship, a better understanding, and that I'll not get crappy letters like I have in the past for several reasons.

Best,
Harold