

Mr. Christopher Sharrett
Theater Department
Villanova University
Villanova, Pa. 19085

3/22/77

Dear Mr. Sharrett,

Your letter of the 17th boils down to I yearn. I need a blanket like Linus. I cling to what I want to believe. I hate to consider what I do not want to believe.

There really is nothing you say about Sprague and the committee that is not wishful thinking. In this you have lost your critical faculties. Sprague has brought forth a report, the mountain of the laboring ~~man~~ merry mason having delivered a mouse. It is tangibel. It is specific. It begins with presumptions of guilt withput any investigation of the claim to it. As recently as yesterday his co. 2 man on being asked me for a court record they should have obtained in the six months of their life and have not. Even when five months ago I told them where to get it. Now if you want to regard this sample as indicative of serious intentions, minimum competence or common every-day honesty, you have that flat-world right.

In common with many your institution has opened its door to every nut, self-seeker and other assassination ripoff artist. Its students and some of its faculty are, in common with others, high on the heady stuff those with ordinary critical faculties would not take a second look at.

I hope you can realize that if I continued correspondence like this I'd spend my time doing nothing else - and that you really have not responded to fact except with untenable theory. Wishfully. I think, no offense intended, immaturity.

Life is real. People are bastards. Politicians are sometimes crooks. I can't change this for you. I can't give you the reassurance your letter seeks and still be honest. If your taste runs to the unreal I cannot satisfy your taste and would not if I could.

You might want to reexamine the thinking that has you unconcerned about how the committee does its work.

I hope you can understand that it is impossible to respond to the kinds of questions you asked about fact and still have time for anything else. This is why I write and publish books and do appear at colleges and universities when asked. If the institutions opt the commercializers and the self-promoters, as most do, they spread disinformation. The effect of this is visible in your statement for which I'd like to know the basis: "According to Jim Lesar, Ray has actually identified Raoul as Frenchy of Dealey Plaza fame..." If you had set yourself to be more totally incorrect you could not have been. At the same time I am without doubt that you did not make this up. "...is Ray jerking us around or what?" There is jerking around, but not by Ray. I guess the or what consists in the total lack of discrimination in speakers for presentations and matter for reading.

Lou Gordon pulled some dirty tricks on the air, as you should have observed. ^{*}his included breaking his work and violating confidence. I am not now prepared to go farther than I did then when I had no real choice with the cameras rolling.

Sincerely,

villanova
university

VILLANOVA, PENNSYLVANIA 19085

Theatre Department

Christopher Sharrett
120 E State St.
Doylestown, PA 18901

March 17, 1977

Mr Harold Weisberg
Route 12
Old Receiver Road
Frederick, MD

Dear Mr. Weisberg:

I appreciated your recent letter on the House Committee and I must admit I've been rethinking my attitude toward the work of the Committee overall. The Gonzalez affair needs to be explained more clearly and I agree that Sprague seems to be taking his time on cracking this thing when there are certainly numerous leads to follow up. I still feel there is insufficient reason to feel that Sprague is out to sabotage the investigation deliberately or to do a half-hearted job at best. From my own exposure to the Committee and Sprague there is the overwhelming sense that a domestic conspiracy exists in both cases; I can't see Sprague's senior investigators sitting still for a Castro-revenge thesis or something similar, but anything is possible of course. Regarding Sprague's ethics, criticisms against law enforcement people have been prevalent from Wyatt Earp to Jim Garrison; sometimes these men are indeed unscrupulous, even amoral characters but quite often they fill a necessary historical role. I'm not sure where Sprague fits in this category, but, again, I'm more concerned with what he produces than with his moral world-view. As I say I am in the process of looking at this thing more critically but the prospect of seeing the entire House investigation fall through is ~~rather~~ rather alarming to me, so I am still forced to think optimistically and give it some support. I am chiefly concerned with some of the incompetent people on the staff.

I totally forgot to ask you about one aspect of your appearance on the Gordon show, namely, the matter of the eyewitnesses to the King shooting. Certainly some of these people, particularly King's chauffeur, could substantiate your "feeling" that a man fired from the shrubbery directly across from King's position. Do you give little credence to this point or did you simply forget to mention it? Also, according to some periodicals, you have doubts about the Jack Youngblood story. Based on what Chastain has developed and what witnesses have ~~said~~ said (including Jowers and his waitress, Russell Thompson and the ministers, etc.) Youngblood seems a likely candidate at least as someone on the scene at the time. It has been said by someone (I can't recall whom) that Youngblood is not a violent criminal, but this notion doesn't jibe with his military record (of course it depends on one's definition of "violent criminal"). Any thoughts on this? Another matter is the identity of Raoul. According to Jim Lesar, Ray has actually identified Raoul as Frenchy of Dealey Plaza fame, but this point has been mentioned nowhere to my knowledge. Ray himself has failed to mention this in any interview of late; is Ray jerking us around or what?

Thanks for your attention and I hope to confer with you again.

Chris Sharrett