

3/11/72

Dear Ed,

I was glad when you sent me Turner's book over on the Right because of the subject and because it gave me a chance to evaluate his work in greater depth than the Rumparts articles I had seen, all of which were plagiarized, one largely from me. This and what I'd seen of him in New Orleans prejudiced me against him, so I looked forward to reading the book, hoping I'd find something redeeming in it. I didn't. He brags that he was Hoover's crack. Hoover says he was incompetent. I can believe both.

It took some time to read the thing because I am not a fast reader and because I read it nights while waiting for Ed to finish work.

There is, of course, nothing wrong in using secondary sources. However, they should be credited. In almost no case are they and prior to the last two chapters, which are much better and in themselves good, if again unoriginal, even in doctrine, I can identify the source of almost everything. I am not describing a pot-biller; I am describing an ~~xxxxx~~ inadequate, incompetent one. He tries to give the opposite impression and to the uninformed will succeed. The average reader will think this is all his own work. He brags in "When I saw soandso on" but if you read with care on those occasions he didn't even get the time of day. As with Derugh, where all his stuff, punk as it is, comes from Jones. His minute-man stuff is particularly poor consider the Playboy stuff on which he drew, in addition to Jones, and what both have in them. He had to milktoast that. His proper and accurate points include the interrelations, but when he has good ones available he is too lazy or too informed (and I think it is both but in all cases the latter) to use what is available. As you know, I have had an interest in this subject but have not really made an in-depth study. So I'll just give you a couple of examples from my own knowledge. He goes into the meeting at the Pittsburgh hotel, where they had Nazi flags and that whole schmeer. Yet he ignores Butler's presence there. He goes into Imperium and Butler's TV show for Frawley, but ignores the entire show Butler used to promote Imperium - with another character he mentions (and again, with incompetence that is notorious) ~~xxxxxx~~ Myers. Butler gave Imperium by far the largest attention it ever got, with Frawley's money, he goes into all these things ~~xxxx~~ separately, he is right in using the popular designation of Imperium as the American Mein Kampf, yet knows so little of his material that he can't weave them all together when they belong together. I think this is because he is lazy and from his laziness doesn't really know anything.

One of his poorer treatments is of the Tarrant-Ainsworth case, which - happen to know much about (all from other sources, as he does). He lifted that all from a really first-rate job of reporting by Jack Nelson. First of all, the treatment is dishonest in that it places full blame for setting the whole thing up on the ADL. He says they bribed the informants who talked Tarrant into attempting the bombing. But what Nelson also reported he conspired out, which leads me to suspect his source of most of this stuff and their lack of confidence in him, leading them to give him but the thinnest of their materials. The ADL put up the money, and the man who both raised it and turned it over to the authorities is a friend of mine in N.C. Now he may have kept his own clippings files and drawn upon them, but if he did he didn't do that well. He restricted himself to Nelson on this case. Aside from the shallowness of this, as the entire book, he omits one of the key things in that illuminating case consistent with one of the real weaknesses in content, almost omitting the NSRP. Tarrant and Ainsworth were more than KKK. The KKK has become too moderate for some of these sick people. What turned Tarrant on was desegregation and the NSRP. This came out in his trial.

In many cases, quite a few, the addition of no more than a clause could have meant much, but they are never added. Whether it is from ignorance or laziness, the picture of Turner is unflattering, and his work has value for those entirely ignorant of the subject only.

This book answers for me the question I have long held, aside from incredible professional incompetence as an investigator (and of this I have first-hand knowledge in more than one case), can he be as complete corrupt as I have suspected? The answer is he is. One illustration should suffice. He makes several accurate if less than sufficient references to Dennis Hower. At no point does he mention Carol Aydelot, from whom he was inseparable. And both were his sources on Bradley--and he was Garrison's! How I tell you how terrible the Garrison-Bradley thing was? But, knowing these things (and believe me, his omission of Aydelot is not from not knowing about her for I have copies of his interviews with her), knowing how wretched and undependable these people were, all he had on Bradley is from these stinkers when he persuaded Garrison to charge Bradley. Of course, none of this is in his book, least of all in the first person.

The man is really incompetent beyond willingness to believe because he did last 10 years in the FBI. Let me give you couple of illustrations from my own knowledge. I turned a former link named Harry Dean on by radio, kind of like McIntire. He phoned me. I couldn't get back out to California, and in those days I knew few people there. So, I asked an actor friend with no investigating experience at all to speak to him. He called this guy, Harry Dean, on the phone and taped the interview. He sent me a dub. He got together with a woman interested in the assassination and they decided this was a job for that great investigator Turner. They got him to go to LA from Frisco and when Turner's interview was over he had, in toto, less than Dean had blabbed on the phone. And this guy was a walking encyclopedia on the types of whom Turner writes in this book, especially Utt, Rousselot and that gang, he ties the Birchers in with the more extreme types, like Hall, and the rest of what Dean knew had to wait three years until I got out there again, turned him on by radio again, this time he called while I was still in the studio, and he was so anxious to talk he came to where I was staying. I then taped an interview with him in the open. He brought his files! And they had some pretty good stuff. To give you one example, the FBI used him as a source on Hall (remember that last-minute addition to the Report?). But Dean's name is not mentioned in those reports, all of which I dug up and published. Turner knew this because he listed it boldly in gasparts. And their interest in Hall continued long after the Report was out. Dean's records include the name of the agent and the dates he looked Dean up. I left the tape out there for the locals to transcribe, and they were in touch with him. In fact, they gave him transcripts of all my interviews, not on my request. He says he interviewed Hall. True. Everyone did. But none competently. After everyone drained Hall and respite what I alone had written on Hall. I taped three interviews with him while he was in the Vets hospital recently wracked by the earthquake. Hall is such a blabbermouth but he not only talked to me after what I had written of him, but he is so easy to turn on that I got him to volunteer to go to N.C. after he had gone to court and didn't have to. All of them together got nothing from him not in my spontaneous interviews, which they had. And my whole purpose was to get him to go to N.C. I never dreamed the interviews were that incompetent. And the last case of my personal experience with him was an accident. I had gotten a dub of the WBSU Oswald footage. I learned from studying it that the FBI had edited it. But I also had FBI reports describing what they edited out, the other person with LHO, and Secret Service reports on the making of stills before this editing. I located the home of the photog, whose name is Rush. Rush had left N.C. His parents lived in Shreveport. I thought this was a simple enough chore for the Garrison office to perform, so I gave Sciambra the home number. He actually begged me to fly to Shreveport to get the stuff. I refused, saying that was simple enough for a typist, and I went about other work. She, he phoned, found out that Rush was in Frisco. They called this big deal Turner, told him that Rush had taken 17 stills out of the film, and to get them. Turner goes over to Rush, spends all his time telling Rush how great a guy he is, gets only a 10th-generation dub of the WBSU footage Rush had stolen, nothing by way of info, no stills and no account of what happened to the stills (they have disappeared from all official records except for two), and in great excitement he flies to N.C. Garrison was electrified. He phoned me in Dallas, where I was making great progress, insists that I rush back to N.C., that he has the greatest single discovery of all and he must share it with me, and if I'm dubious I have little choice. So, sick and tired, for I'd been away for a hard month, I flew back, had my baggage intercepted in the course of it, gave up good work I could have done, and what do I discover is this greatest info? That footage, all Turner got. I had

to, in the end, tell them to rewind their poor copy. I got my copy, made from what WDCU has in its files, and they went over that, learning nothing and imagining what is not there on Shaw. It couldn't be, but they knew so little of the local information they didn't realize it. And none of them checked it, as I had. But am I telling you enough? I asked a college-student friend in the Bay area speak to Rush. He was afraid. I've never been an investigator, he complained, never conducted an interview. I told him there is no tick to it if the guy will talk, as Rush would. All he had to know what what he wanted to know. I got him to turn his tape recorder on and off the top of the head gave him questions. He then went to Rush. Having understood my questions and knowing something about the subject, he added some of his own. The result is that we got about as much from Rush - none of

which Turner got - as we can expect to unless I can get out there again and try or his recall from what I know. I don't think it will happen, but if a college kid can do it and Turner can't, am I telling you enough about Turner?

So, to sum it up, there is almost no back the publisher could not have gotten who could not have done a better job with the second-hand material in this book. And I'm happy to know that my dislike for the whole is as solidly-based as I'd believed.

Hope things are going well there. JP told me you had returned over some tax trouble. Hope it wasn't serious. Best regards,

PG* I've made a carbon for you and perhaps added a few minor details I would not have to give you an advance reading on what to expect to have happened to your material unless Hinkle adds what is needed. If I do not know why Turner is so incompetent, I suspect laziness can't account for all of it. And if I could spot his sources in this shallow work, I think you'll have little trouble when his book comes out. Is it by McGraw? Man, they've staked out a claim on fakes if it is! They've just been caught in another, the diary of an Indian either over 100 years old now or one who never lived, I'm not sure from the coverage which. And that work is unoriginal, anyway, coming from something published in 1940.

If you knew who the people are I name, you'd know how much Turner really missed. But I think you can see how great an accomplishment it was to miss it, all the sources being willing, most anxious to talk. Take comfort!

Best