

pk return
Dear Dick, *Spiegel*

4/13/71

I read your letter of the 9th as soon as it arrived this a.m. In order to keep it from getting lost in a rapidly accumulating stack, I make immediate response that time prevents from being complete.

As I told you, I will not tell you what I know of the origin of the sketch. What you say is, aside from the involvement of your then associates, exactly what Fred told me more than a month before the NYTimes story. I had, by then, not only given this to the FBI and AP, but earlier I had used it on TV, in news conferences, etc., and it is I who immediately supplied Ramparts its copy, when they asked me to be a member of their proposed King Assassination Inquiry Committee.

The reason I will not tell you (and others) is not because I don't think you do not intend to keep your word, but I think, as has happened too often, the time will come when you will not, intending nothing but the best. This is such too important for the publicity-seeking approach. It is also such too dangerous for hanging around with. I have heard one of your appearances, and you do not really know the story to begin with. So far as publication by Berkeley is concerned, I'd be happy for him to review FRAME-UP, but insofar as the publication of any evidence is concerned, I am opposed to it. First of all, in that very considerable reduction of everyone's credibility he brought to pass, with no doubt the best of intentions, but publishing that overflowing hopped of shit, he has destroyed his own. And, the time is past when casual mention of evidence in minor publications can do us any good. The contrary is probable. Moreover, where investigations are incomplete, something you have never learned and thus helped hurt, the last thing a pro does is say anything. There is no better way of closing openings, of alerting those who have the capability of doing it, have a clear record of having done it, and now have you more reason to. This is a man's business in which everyone would be better off if those with boys' minds quit, and it is rapidly getting more dangerous.

Because you asked me to, I return to the traps again. Your letter proves the point I've been trying to make to you, you cast from your mind everything that is not congenial to your preconception. I have gone over all of this with you before and you have no recollection of it, which proves I wasted my time. I had two separate and independent investigations made, both by pros, both my friends, and they are consistent. I even built a trap in and neither fell into it. Their reports are entirely consistent. Roger Craig is as well-intentioned as he is sick. If you'd ever done the most cursory checking of the basis of his claim that what he said was altered, you'd know it not only wasn't, but it couldn't possibly have been. If you ever had any experience with court reporters, as I have, you'd have know to begin with they simply do not do what he alleged. You simply seize upon loose language that you like, whether or not it is credible, as many of us did with those reports, and blinded yourself to everything else. There were no arrests. They were taken into custody, as perhaps 50 were, and then released. You may say that names should have been taken and recorded, and they should have been, but in a time like that it is not impossible that no record was kept, there having been no official record made to begin with. Also, if you know Fritz as I have come to through contact with those who know him well and have worked with him for years, he was always careful to keep nothing, not only in this case. He often drove Henry Wade up the wall by not having minimal records, no notes, etc. That is his pig's way. In spite of all you seize upon from the most dependable sources, those men were taken behind the P.O. Annex, in the 200 block of S Main, as I long ago told you, and nowhere else.

Now you can insist that photos show these men taken from a balcony at the foot of Towers' tower escapes me. I'd like to see such a photo.

Contrary to your formulation, which extends your preconception, that "the real question is who were the three", my belief is that the real question is, what basis

is there, with what we know (and I grant there is too much we do not know) for believing or even suspecting that they are connected with anything? Let us begin with a reasonable beginning, not some fairy tale or wild conjecture. In fact, I'd like to know if there is any rational reason for calling one "Frenchie".

You talk about three eyewitnesses re sketch (I think I've also heard you say six). Can you name me one? Just one who identified Ray or gave any description that could have led to this sketch?

I know Trent was in Canada, I know Gary Murr gave him about 20 lbs of clippings he was to share with all of us, including me, and I've not seen one. Bernabel told me that he did, perhaps separately, conduct this interview, and I know him well enough to trust him. I have no doubt Trent did the same thing. The difference is that Trent keeps things to himself and Dick told me.

What you say of the Ray refusing to identify the man (who is supposed in any formulation to be Ray and nobody else) is sophistry. I read that affidavit when Bud got it. If he had said anything justifying this interpretation, I am sure I'd not have overlooked it. But have you asked yourself is it possible this is a sketch of a man Ray didn't know or didn't recognize? How, in this case, would his answer have differed?

Dick, without intending offense, aside from confabulating, you have not done sufficient work in sufficient depth. Still with the best of intentions, you pick up parts of the work of others, rush into misuse of it, kill the prospect of doing more with it, and wonder why people get up tight. This phobia that causes rushing into print with everything has been very costly and may yet be fatal. There are those who do share things, sometimes not knowing those with whom they share them, sometimes, sometimes not knowing the frailty of judgement of those with whom they do share, hence to whose hands it will get. Bud, who blew what I had given him in strictest confidence, gave me an honest and respectable answer: don't trust him with anything I don't want known. In some cases, where I felt I had to, I nonetheless have, but I do worry about it, and this has nothing to do with my estimate of him or my liking for him. It is simply that sometimes he just blabs, which I fear is a weakness to which we are all prone. None of us is used to living a clandestine life. I think it is to his credit that he recognized this and counselled me as he did. Let me interject, because it comes to mind, that much less than you seem to think has been shown me. My work is close to 100% my own. It would be better were this not the case.

I put aside copies of our exchange to give Bud when next I see him, so the remainder of the tape and transcript is there, as I have already mentioned it to Jim.

The Raoul approach you suggest and you say Bud agreed to is a good way to get killed. I am anxious to know he this person is, but that is the last way I'd try to find out at this point. And I think it is also the best way to turn Ray off. And do you consider Manek a French-Canadian name? There also is none in the N.O. phonebook. ...on what basis do you say Foreman ever indicated belief in a conspiracy?...I do not know and have never tried per se to learn who committed the JFK assassination. As I told Bud when he was first talking about starting his committee, this is the wrong approach, one that can't succeed then or at this juncture....Aside from what I said before about refusing to share, I do not at this point have any reason to believe you really knew anything of your own work about the King assassination, and what I have heard you say on the radio, frankly, terrifies me. It is this kind of thing that will ruin us all and will, someday, when you come to realize it, seriously trouble you for your part. No offense. Cander. I was sick when I saw sick Jim's sick shit in shitty Joesten's shitty "news" letter. Abject, prideless, nauseating and false. Joesten is a faker and one of the least trustworthy of men who imagines things and persuades those anxious to be persuaded, unless he got them recently, he doesn't even have the 26 but uses of them what he finds in the works of other. Bastard.