To Andrew Sciambre From Earold Weisberg frospective witnesses - Roger Crabg- against.

I do not know whether your intend calling Roger as withness and presume you are considering it. There are things he testified to before the Warren Commission that may make him attractive. However, he will not survive cross examination and he will, under cross examination, be a very reat emberrassment to Jim, if not to you case (and I think both).

Of course, Bredley could not, simultaneously, be both a neetly-dressed Secret Service agent at the TSBD and a tramp arrested there. The other side certainly will know that,

When Penn took him to California, they had a thing for him at Maggie Bield's. They gave him a Zerox 🐙 of his testimony and he went over it and wrote in the "errors" of the court reporter. I have had enough experience to know that court reporters do not make such "errors". Roger was just changing his mind. This xerox has been going around. If it surfaces in the hands of the defense, Roger will be a great liability. Especially now that he has been, reportedly, shot at again. Each time he is shot at there is no witness, each time he is under some distress, this time because he had not been able to get Garrison by phone. What he might asy that is valuable can almost without exception be redundantly refuted by the other side. I used him in my writing, by citing his testimony and nothing else, but I would not use him in court. He makes a very good appearance, is quite sincere and comes actross this way, persuasively, but is not credible, particularly on the Paine car, where he has it both ways, one way in his testimony, another in his Field "correction". However, if you do call him, I think you should have this Keroxing and be prepared to answer it, for unless you do he will be a great liability.