

Dear Dick,

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 in 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 much too important for the publicity-seeking approach. It is also much too dangerous for hawking 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 heaped 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 even 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 tramps 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've had any experience with court reporters, as I have, you'd have known to begin with they simply do not do what he alleged. You simply chose 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 knew Frits 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 chose upon from the most undependable sources, these 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 boxcar at the foot of Bowers' 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 "Frenchy".

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, and 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 Manak 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 know 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. Candor. 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 regently, he doesn't even have the 26 but uses of them what he finds in the works of other. ^{astily}

Apologies for the lack of typing. I can't type
and I can no longer afford to pay
for it.

①

April 9, 1971

Dear Harold :

Many thanks for your long letter. I want you to know that your appeal has reached me. I have already seen that I must return to objectivity and the kind of scientific approach which has dominated most of my career. Let us, you and I, reopen the kind of dialogue we once pursued, with jointly open minds, sharing our discovery of evidence, and letting the combination lead us to the truth. We have certainly never disagreed on one thing; we seek the truth.

With respect to the tramps, the sketch of the King assassin, and related topics, let's back off to verifiable raw evidence. If we can agree on what the facts are, then we can pursue our way toward the truth. I will begin from my end, by giving you all I know.

Firstly, whatever or whoever the tramps were, including the possibility they were just tramps; the raw evidence about their arrest starts with Harkness' and Bowers' statements and moves through Elkins' statement to the series of photos by Allen and Smith. All of this is documented in my "tramp booklet", which Bud has in the office, and I don't now recall whether you ever received a copy. It became too expensive for me to duplicate after my income went to zero. Ask Bud to borrow the one in the office.

The photos, plus eyewitness statements, I contend, place the boxcar from which the three tramps were arrested at the foot of Bowers' tower at the time of the arrest. Confusion over where the arrest took place may stem from the possibility that two (or maybe more) groups of tramps were apprehended that day.

Roger Craig recently told me that he personally witnessed a group of around eight or nine tramps being arrested and rousted out of box cars, on the freight tracks south of the triple overpass, sometime later in the afternoon of the 22nd. He said he was sure that our three tramps were not part of the larger group, but had been arrested near Bowers' tower.

At any rate, the question really is; who were the three, what were their names, what happened to them after Elkins had them taken to Fritz, did Fritz book them, if so where is the booking record, who is and was the other cop accompanying them to Elkins' office, what was he wearing in his ear and why

If you have answers, or potential answers, or ways of obtaining answers to any of these questions I would appreciate having them.

Next, the sketch which looks so remarkably like Frenchy, the middle sized tramp.

I don't know when Fred Newcomb first recognized the resemblance, but I know when I did. It was the day after the sketch first appeared on national TV. The man who deserves the credit for first recognizing the similarity is Jeff Paley. I was in Florida on vacation at the time and he called me, through my answering service, to say that he had seen the sketch on TV, and that it looked just like Frenchy.

I picked up a paper the next day and sure enough, the sketch was a dead ringer for Frenchy's face. When I returned from vacation, I made up a comparison of the sketch and Frenchy's photo from one of the tramp photos. I made them identical in size.

Then I phoned Trent Gough to tell him about it. Trent became very excited and arranged a press conference in New York to show the comparison to the newspapers. Pete Khiss from the Times came and did a very fine story on it which I'm sure you remember seeing. Later, Bill Turner did the same thing with the San Francisco Chronicle and published the comparison in Ramparts.

My impression has been that Fred's efforts trailed mine by some period of time.

Prior to any of the publicity, I explored the origin of the sketch. The FBI releases described the artist who drew it, as a Mexican police artist

named Sergio Saubert, based in the Mexico City office of the Mexican police force. I telephoned him and discovered he spoke almost no English. At that time, I was still a partner with Touche, Ross, Bailey, & Smart and had formed a close friendship with a Mexican national ^{and his family} who was partner-in-charge of Touche's Mexico City office.

I called him and asked, as a special favor to me, if he would interview Saubert and ask a series of questions of him in Spanish. He ^(or rather his son) did and the following is a summary of what Saubert told me through my Mexican partner ^{son} acting as interpreter.

Saubert was asked by the Mexico City police to make a sketch of the King assassin for the FBI. The sketch was needed in a hurry to be used at all border stations to look for the assassin. It was also transmitted back to the FBI in Washington after Saubert made it.

He made the sketch using a facial components system which had been developed in Europe and was then being used by the Mexican police. The system differed considerably from the one used by the FBI and other U.S. police agencies. Saubert considered the European system to be superior to the U.S. one.

He discussed, through an interpreter, the

descriptions of the assassin which the FBI had obtained from three eyewitnesses, with an FBI man in Washington over long distance telephone. The sketch was made from a series of facial components matching the optimum or average of each piece from the three witnesses descriptions. It is a cyclic feedback process. (Presumably the FBI guy in Washington had the components in front of him.)

The whole story sounded strange to me at the time. Why would a Mexican police artist be used? Why wouldn't the FBI make up a sketch and photocopy it to Mexico City? How can one use the component system without direct presence of the eyewitnesses? At any rate, I took the story at face value (no pun intended) at the time. I trust my Mexican partner and his so implicitly. If someone was lying, it was Jaubert, or the FBI.

I'm not sure which three eyewitnesses were the ones involved. If you have a different story about how the sketch originated I'd like to hear it. Most people I show the comparison to, say they feel the sketch must have been made from the photo. The Jaubert part of the story could be true with the FBI guy at the other end of the phone sitting there looking at Frenchy's photo, feeding Jaubert a phony story about witnesses descriptions. If so,

that would indeed be very interesting. If the Canadian truck driver story is true*, and if Foreman did get those photos from the FBI (as well as getting copies from me through Huie), it would indicate the FBI had an intense interest in Frenchy very early in the game.

As for what Foreman said and did with Ray and the photos, I assumed, when I wrote my last letter that Bud had given you a copy of Ray's seven page affidavit which was attached to his motion for a new trial. If you haven't seen it, ask Bud for a copy. It describes what I'm talking about. Remember, as you read it, that Foreman got those photos from me, and that he showed them to Ray because I triggered Huie and Foreman into doing it. Maybe he also discussed it with the FBI or Clark, and maybe he even obtained more copies of the photos from them, but the initial impetus came from me.

The 7 page affidavit is also my basis for saying Ray "would not" rather than "could not" identify anyone, including Frenchy, as Raoul. After you read it you'll see what I mean. I didn't mean to be obtuse in my last letter. As I say, I assumed you had read Ray's affidavit. I believe as you do, that Ray fears being murdered in jail if he reveals too

*The Galt interview was not conducted by Bernabei, but by Trent Gough

much about Raoul or others involved. I believe that's why he "would not" identify anyone for Foreman. On top of that, when Bud first showed Ray those same photos at my suggestion, (This happened much later as you know), Ray became very suspicious of Bud and accused him of being connected with the FBI.

If Ray had by then concluded that the FBI framed him and that they were trying to find an excuse to get him killed in the jail, by identifying Raoul, you can see how he would feel about anyone showing up with those photos.

Finally, the Huie taped conversation. Bud has a record of it, but I can't remember whether he has the actual tape or not. If not, I'll get you a copy. The fright of Huie is partially evident from his voice, but was more evident from an eyeball to eyeball confrontation we had when I showed him the photos.

I don't remember saying that I had any direct evidence of Foreman's being frightened. What I did mean to say was that his actions after receiving the photos seemed very strange and he seemed to reverse directions about that time. I realize upon reflection that I had no indication of

his reversal except Huie's statements to me by phone about what Foreman was going to do, coupled with his (Huie's) complete belief that Raoul existed and had fired the shot.

Huie's identification of the three women was as follows: One of them was in a restaurant or bar in Atlanta, and the other two were in bars in Montreal. He did not say which bars or restaurants, nor give any names or descriptions. One of the projects Bud has always had in mind, given enough time and money, is to go back to Ray; obtain the names of the bars in Atlanta and Montreal where he and Raoul were together, and retrace Huie's steps.

The only description of Raoul, Huie gave me as coming from the three women was; sandy haired, in his late twenties and French Canadian. It could be Manek. When Hanes told Bud about that, we checked a number of other stories about Frenchy and could neither confirm or deny it.

I did not know you had written part of a book on King-Ray until a few months ago. Again, I assumed that Bud was passing on to you everything I had given him. I don't know about Trent. He didn't tell me you were doing a King book.

When I say Foreman and Huie turned around, or were turned around, I mean only that they seemed on the surface to be convinced of a conspiracy, along with Hanes. The trilogy in the third look article, Foreman's actions with the Judge, with Ray, and at the minitrial, and finally Huie's book; just seem to me to be too much of a pattern to have come from self conviction. There just had to be a major payoff, or major threat somewhere.

With respect to your comments on Garrison, they are well taken. Perhaps you did not know the details of my several meetings with Jim, Al Oser and others in New Orleans before and during the trial. I could not see why he was handling it the way he was and so commented to him. In the specific case of the photographic evidence, I helped Oser obtain a great deal of data and a number of photos and movies which they didn't use. I also warned him against using things like the photos of Walthers and an FBI agent "picking up a bullet", or the photos of a "shot from the sewer."

Some day, Harold, I would like to hear from you "what Jim blew", or read your full manuscript on the JFK case. If you believe you know who planned and committed the crime, could you summarize

**

at least the names for me sometimes.

For now, lets concentrate on Ray-King. Tell me what you know about the sketch and Huie and Ray which you have not published. Please do not be worried about my revealing it to anyone (other than Bud of course I assume you tell him everything) or about my publishing anything on it. If you and I can jointly derive at more truth than we have separately, you have my oath and personal guarantee that you have all publishing rights. Ed Berkeley (no matter what you think of him) would be happy to publish a summary article from you on Ray-King. He keeps asking me to write one and I continually refer him to you.

Please don't feel you have offended me Harold, with any of your comments or criticisms. You know how much respect I have for you and your works. You also know that I would never have started had it not been for your encouragement in 1966. Please help me now to unpave those roads to hell.

Yours with regards
Dick Sprague

** Have you seen Jim's explanation of his handling of the trial and leaving things out of his book, which he wrote in a letter to Joesten, published in Joesten's Truth letter.