

George Lardner, newsroom
Washington Post
1150 15 St., NW
Washington, D.C. 20071

2/11/92

Dear George,

Although you are to phone this afternoon, I write in part not to forget and in part not to take too much time then.

Disclosure of the Dallas police records reminds me that years ago I got a microfilm of what they'd given the Texas Court of Inquiry for its apology for an investigation. I then had two sets printed. I have one, about a file drawer, and I gave the other to Fenssterwald. I suppose if you have any interest, Jim knows where it is. I am sure I read every page at that time and I do not recall anything like what I've heard of the contents of the records being disclosed. About which I'd appreciate the Houston Post and any other stories you may see.

If I hear from ^{Wade or} anyone else that I am getting copies of these police records I'll let you know.

A little before you phoned last night, which was about the time you'd be wanting to head home, I got the strange call about which I made a hasty memo this morning. There is nothing about it that makes sense. While I refer to the possibility that Oliver Stone may be looking to make a little trouble or embarrassment, at this juncture I see no rational reason for him to take time for such pettiness.

In a way while I was walking and thinking about this earlier I was reminded of the "Mr. Hunt" letter that looks like Oswald's writing. I did not believe it was genuine and I did nothing about it. Penn Jones got a story on it that provoked interest. Other critics, including little-known Howard Roffman, got identical letters and xeroxes. Mo Waldron (did you know him?) got a Times Mexico City correspondent go to that address. Mo told me it looked like a safe house. I wrote the "Dr. R" or "S" at that address. My letter was not returned and I got no response. Mo and I, perhaps others, then suspected it might be a bit of CIA games-playing.

I tell you about this call in the event something turns up that can relate to it and so that, if you speak to any other critics, you can ask if they had any similar calls. It is in all respects odd to me, especially the content and timing.

With many too many interruptions I've been writing a rather long article on the publicity sought by the Warren former counsel, probably only a partial record for history. Not one of them could make any such self-defense with honesty. I'd appreciate a copy of their letter and anything else you may have on their ploy. I'm including Ruseff's dissent and my relations with him. To now this rested on my word only but a friend who went over his record sent me some copies. This includes his legislative assistant's comment on my first

book and the opinion that Ruseel and I see eye to eye on the single-bullet invention of Specter's. "CEC," who as I recall was named Campbell, had a good opinion of the book. He did not refer to any other specific content and he correctly understood that I was focusing on the counsels rather than the members. Ruseel said the only question he had about "this chap" is my association with Garrison, his interpretation of Garrison's introduction to Oswald in New Orleans. I did not ask it of him and learned that the publisher had only when I asked about the delay in ^{the book's} appearance.

Not much chance I'll be able to do more on it this week unless I can do a little this afternoon because of medical appointments, tomorrow morning at Hopkins and beginning tomorrow afternoon Gerald Posner and his wife will be here for help on an assassination book he is writing. He was delayed because of the delivery to him of more records he will probably not be willing to disclose relating to Martin Borman. He did a Mengele book and another on the subject in general. I've not read them.

I forgot to note in the memo that the woman who said she was with Israeli intelligence did not give me her name ~~and~~ in part to see if she'd give me some means of getting in touch with her and in part because I thought if she gave me one it would be phony I did not ask her name to see if she would even give me one. She didn't.

The Dallas papers may have had something on Howard's Rickey White fakery. If so I'd appreciate copies. I heard that ~~xxx~~ rather than breaking off with him when it was apparent the White story was phony Stone gave him \$80,000 for consultancy and another \$40,000 I think after the symposium in Dallas last November.

Unless I misread the counsels' stories I think Adams may still be ~~pl~~ alive. There were 14 assistant counsel, 11 signed the statement and this would seem to mean Adams is alive. He was the first to quit the Commission, very early. That is what gave Specter charge of the areas that were to have been under Adams. While I do not know it ~~gt~~ be a fact I've always believed that Adams left quietly because of disagreement with what the Commission was doing. Thus I wonder if he signed it and if he is alive. Hubert left in June because of his disagreements. He agreed to see me and then changed his mind. He and Jenner are dead.

Gus Russo says that the book of Stone's last script will be out within a month. It is to be part of a monstrous Stone play, having it used in schools to teach the assassination!

Best,

Harold

Phone call allegedly from Israeli Intelligence re "Captain Grayston (sic) 2/11/92
Lynch," Warren Commission exhibit 237, *said to be him.*

At about 7 p.m. a woman with a very clear, educated voice, perfect English, phoned. Asking first for me she next asked "Do you know Robert Groden?" I said I did. She then asked me if I remember this "Odum/237 exhibit, I said I do, and she launched into a description of the man as a professional assassin for the CIA, including in Cambodia, Viet Nam and elsewhere, while in special forces. When I asked her how this could be proven she was offended or more likely feigned offense. She told me to consult Peter Wyden's The Bay of Pigs book. I told her I was not able to at that moment but long ago had read the book. (At this point she reflected knowing nothing about me, one of the reasons I do not believe that she was Israeli Intelligence phoning from Tel Aviv.) I do not recall exactly what she then said about two version of this one picture in that book but this appeared to be to her a major point she was making.

She never explained why she phoned me or her purpose and I did not ask her.

During the conversation she expressed confidence in Groden, hardly the way for an informed person to approach me. She trusts him and the Dallas JFK Information Center, which she said arranged photo interpretation *for her.* Again, hardly the need of an intelligence agency of ^{to} people one would trust. When I raised such questions she acted like she had been doing me a great favor and if I did not appreciate it, the hell with me. Each time I explained that I was not questioning her but her sources with whom I'd had my own experiences and I did question then and it seemed to me *Israeli intelligence.* they should be interested in that. "They" represented by her were not.

She huffed up when I said that there is a difference between allegations and proof and I'd need proof, another suspicious way ^{for her} to behave because, obviously, anyone does. She indicated she would break the call of as wasting her time each time I cast doubt on her source. When I told her that the AIC in Dallas had ~~not~~ faked the Ricky White case, what should certainly interest any intelligence agency ^{no interest only indignation.} making any use of it, Ditto when I told her I knew Groden well enough to be the godfather of his first child and doubted much of what he said. It was when I told her about Hugh McDonald's book that ^{she said it is factual,} I knew it was a fake ^{I told her,} when she ^{again} had said that McDonald had the story right, that I'd known his lady friend Eve Leonard, whose husband had started the first local radio station, ^{local area} and ^{nothing} that ~~did not~~ discourage her endorsement of his book I then told her that I had been hired by a publisher whose name she didn't ask (and I told her when she didn't that I had to keep that confidential) to evaluate that book, she again was indifferent, ignoring it entirely. So I asked her where Lynch was when he fired the shot. She'd said he was the assassin, and anyone with any knowledge of the material knows there was more than one assassin, she said the Records Building. I then told her that McDonald had said the assassin lurked in a lady's room for about an hour at lunch time to make the shot (I did not tell her there is no lady's room

on that wall) she asked me if I had read the book, I replied that I had, and she said the book says no such thing, merely that he shot from the second floor. I then told her I was talking about a summary of the manuscript, that I had told McDonald that he would look ridiculous saying that and he changed it. That is what led her to indicate she was wasting her time and I then, without using those words indicated that I felt that way and was about to end the conversation she hung up.

I did not believe that anyone with or for Israeli intelligence would phone me on this in the open when it was known that the US is monitoring international calls and has more than the usual interest in Israel now because of US policy. I wondered immediately why if she was speaking for the Mossad it would not have sought me out in person, easy for it and without possibility of eavesdropping. I believed while we were conversing that it would have sent someone from Washington, not much more than an hour away, and might in turn, if it had any JFK assassination interest, be interested in what I have and can provide. It was while we were talking that I wondered whether she was another Oliver Stone effort to boobytrap me.

Her voice was distinctive yet without trace of any accent. It appeared to be the voice of an American woman. Certainly no trace of Herbraic, Jewish, British, French, ~~German~~, man, French, Italian, Spanish or any other accent. There was nothing to indicate what kind of a US accent other than not of the South. So I wondered whether she was an actress. It was a remarkably clear connection, much clearer than any I've had recently with Britain, for example, or many parts of the US.

What also seemed strange is that she reflected knowledge of only the nutty theories and made no reference to anyone any intelligence agency with any subject-matter knowledge at all would credit or would believe would impress me. When I pretended I could not remember Harman Kimsey's name, from the Mc Donald book, she provided it promptly. But when I gave Leonard the wrong first name, as I do not recall of Grace rather than Eva, she did not correct me. For other reasons I believed while we were talking that she was not from any intelligence agency. One is that no one trained to be an assassin would have permitted himself to be seen at any USSR embassy or consulate and would have assumed the CIA was photographing those who went there. It also would not have under any circumstances have given the Warren Commission and/or the FBI any photo of any of its people of however indirect a connection, especially not one of one of its alleged assassins. Yet the name Grayson rather than Grayston Lynch seemed slightly familiar. I do not today place it.

She made no response, perhaps hesitated for a moment, when I told her ^{McDonald's having} ~~my knowledge of~~ the assassin lurking in the ladies room was ridiculous and changed when published. That certainly would have been a red flag to any spookery. When I said I'd need proof she offered none and made no suggestion of how I could get any, also not spookery behavior. If one was trying to impress me she would not have hung up when I directed her that way. It did not sound like Rusconi's voice, which I heard only once. I can think of nobody else who had any present interest in boobytrapping me or who would have been so amateurish in the effort.

Later. I have to modify saying I can think of nobody else with a present interest in boobytrapping me and perhaps about whether this woman was acting for Israeli intelligence. The French SDECE published a phony book that seemed to have been intended as a favor for the CIA. It and the movie made of it could have been intended to boobytrap Garrison and came close. I prevented the movie endorsement and probably had something to do with his suspending his public support for the book.

The book was originally titled, "L'amerique Brule (burns)" but Garrison suggested it be titled, as it then was, "Farewell America.

There is ample documentation of SDECE involvement in my records on it.

Why may remain a question, as it may with this call.

But if we answer the first why, why Israeli spooks would do this for the CIA (or anyone else) by considering that a favor, there remains why the CIA or anyone else would at this time want anything at all done by anybody.

So, in simplification, I see no real purpose or need for the call that I did get.