

MEDICAL SCHOOL  
DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHIATRY AND NEUROLOGY  
MINNEAPOLIS, MINNESOTA 55455

November 26, 1968

Dear Vince,

Good to hear from you and glad to hear that you are going down to see Jim. My major contribution to the case thus far is needling you to get as active as you were before.

The case against Turner:

1. First of all, the best way to infiltrate is through a guy like Turner. This is how spy work, even in the comic strips and movies works. It is the way Oswald worked. You pretend to be a member of the other side. Once a member you help with many things, especially things that are in the works anyway and will be solved anyway and report on the progress of the investigation. Secondly, you sabotage anything you can which is of major importance, but all the time you constantly reinforce the head man for all of his ideas. One of the most effective activities in a case like this is feeding of false info, or in Jim's case, encouragement to use stuff publicly which will fall apart or widen the credibility gap. Things don't have to be false in general to ruin Jim. For instance, too much talk about the military-industrial complex in broad generalizations would bring him on as a nut, even if, as you and I feel, they were probably involved or at least looked on as observers and took advantage of it (being glad that they didn't have to get their hands dirty, but that the end was accomplished). We can present the case for it, but none of us make wild statements until we have. Furthermore, getting Garrison to become specific on certain points on the basis of poor, or unreliable, info as he was planning for the 22nd would be the end of the road. This would have exactly the same end as the Potem suggestion of running him for President, and ironically, Turner was in on that one anyway. Specifically, Turner's constant encouragement (according to Harold) of Jim during the now famous "chalk talk" and his encouraging Jim to add Omaha to the cities on the board (the ultimate in cities which no one would consider involved as far as the public is concerned) underlines this point. So Turner, as an "ex-agent," is in perfect position to be immediately accepted and trusted by the left. It is the perfect cover under which an agent can operate with maximum effectiveness, and I doubt if his principal job was Garrison at first, since he preceded him and wasn't interested at all in the assassination until just before Jim came into the picture.

2. One of the best tests of the above is has Bill contributed anything? As far as Harold and I know he has not contributed one new thing, despite all of his money and time-consuming "work" on the case. He utilizes everybody else's stuff without giving credit and on many occasions has misused something or released it prematurely.

3. Has he done anything wrong? Yes, besides trying to set Jim up for a killing by the press which the public would have boaght, he may have done a number of things:

- a. He is rummred (all over the place) to literally pillage Jim's files and often to take things with him, and in some cases may not have returned them. Someone who has access to those files like Boxley or Turner is taking things because much has disappeared. Remember the stuff I took down there that Boxley took such interest in--it disappeared at least

within a week! In that case it could have been Boxley, I don't know, but we know that Turner really goes through the files and so far no one has explained who it is that steals the stuff.

b. Turner's investigations and interviews are incompetent to the degree that it is hard to believe that he is even trying to pretend to be an investigator. Needless to say, an old time veteran of the FBI knows how to interview and is quite good at interrogation and at challenging a witnesses' story. The Turner tapes I have heard have indicated total acceptance of witnesses without any good questions being asked about obvious discrepancies in the witnesses story or the nature of the story. For example, stores a lot harder to believe than Rita Rollen's are accepted without question. Specifically, his interview of the "minister" who claims that he met Sirhan the day before RFK's assass. and was told to be outside the hotel that night at 11:00 was accepted by Bill whole hog with only a few easy questions which made the guy's story sound even better--this I have heard the whole tape of and herrified Hal Verb by blowing up at Turner after hearing it. Hal, of course, had to admit that the things I pointed out were for feal, but had never suspected either that Turner might be incompetent or useless.

c. Turner misquotes important witnesses, chancing losing them as witnesses through false publicity of a sensationalist sort, and at the very least discrediting both Jim and us. Example: According to Fran Galt who was one of Bolden's best friend's in prison, when Bolden read the Ramparts Article which had Garrison on the cover and statements attributed to Abe on pg.68, he got angry (Fran's spontaneous word, not mine). He never at any time said anything about what Oswald was alleged to have said when still alive and in police hands. He claims that that is an absolute fabrication. Furthermore, Bolden's specific charge is not that they failed to protect JFK in Dallas on the 22nd, but that they had been violating duty regulations when protecting JFK for quite some time and that Dallas was one instance. Abe, for instance, said that the same thing went on when he was in the detail guarding Hyannis Port. Let's face it, everyone knows that they were in the Fort Worth clubs drinking until late hours the night before from sources closer to the fact than Bolden, and that was even in the Warren Report. In addition, Bolden added the most damaging claim of all about the CIA hiring him for Bethesda, something which may be our most important single direct link-up. In addition, he told of the Chicago plot and one of the men having Garcia Gonzales in his name. Turner mentions him on pg68 but doesn't mention Bolden's claim. Themisquoting of Abe could hurt us in future dealings with him, and ironically, it seems to be a complete fabrication which Abe himself might have attacked us on publicly. This piece of info, needless to say, would have been important if true but would have been equally dangerous if not--which it is. My informant is very reliable and everything else he has told me dovetails exactly with what Bolden told Lane.

d. Turner supports Potem and other obvious agents, and they would never get into the whole thing if they didn't come through him. You know this story much better than I do.

e. Turner is in charge of Rose and has always defended him. He only reluctantly admitted that Rose at first denied the McNabb incident in Mexico, and then dismissed it as an indiscretion. Even if the Mexico incident were a discretion, it might be sufficient reason to keep Rose away from important work. Rose is certainly a strong suspect as an agent himself, and you have my memos on that. Turner's attempt to cover for him stinks.

f. Turner is a major supporter of the Nagell story and gave it prominence in Ramparts. Nagell is an agent and there is absolutely no question about it. If there was any originally, he was just arrested in East Germany where he went after meeting Jim in Central park. Ironically, he was suddenly released (as Bolden was not), and at a time when many of us were not buying his story and he was of little value. We have been easily able to reach Nagell who led a easy life even in Springfield as compared to the other prisoners (i.e. he and Kroman did no work) and has not had threats within the prison. Compare this to Bolden who they work over all the time, who has been threatened and spent much time in solitary confinement, and who Kroman didn't get to talk to much (and brought out nothing significant about). Kroman himself, who Turner believed, is most likely an agent, and at best being used by the other side. It is obvious and easy to spot. As you know from my letters, even now I am discovering things he lied about. Rose, of course, is tied in with the Nagell thing, and he is the guy who turned up Dave Hepburn with the 5 volumes. He was also working on Fred Lee Crisman, the "Chinaman," who is another sensational piece of info were he for real, which I doubt. Let's face it, the CIA is stronger and better than ever, and no one ever found out before who their paymaster of assassins was, even if such a person exists, which I doubt knowing how the agency functions from books such as the Invisible Govt.

To return to Nagell for a moment, two obvious reasons he shouldn't have been trusted from the beginning are: 1. His wife and kids couldn't be located, which means that they could have been blackmailing Nagell with their safety, 2. He could have been killed at any time without attracting attention, but never even came close or was threatened, unlike Bolden who is probably for real. In other words, someone in federal hands making a claim like his which would blow the case wide open and Prove beyond a shadow of a doubt CIA direction of the assass (unlike Bolden whose evidence is merely suggestive of such involvement) is expendable. Prison deaths are easy to arrange and easy to coverup, especially since the govt. is engaged in the coverup directly by investigating it on their own.

g. The Underhill story according to the copy of Ramparts' file which Hal Verb had is probably untrue, and at the very least unproven. The Ramparts' memos by the guy who did the interviews concluded that there was reason to believe that Underhill was crazy at the time and there was no evidence that he was either CIA or military. The "close friend" to whom he allegedly told his story was not even known by his wife as a friend of his. In addition, in Hal's copy of the file (which I assume was complete since it contained conclusions), there was no report on the autopsy. In short, the whole thing could be of no substance, but Bill got Jim to use in in Playboy and then gave it prominence in Ramparts. Again we see the pattern of evidence which can either help a lot or hurt a lot--sensational stuff which Jim and everyone else uses assuming that it is true--but which is at best unsubstantiated. There is no need for such stuff or even speculation about it unless it is true. All of this stuff is extra--it doesn't fill in holes in Jim's case but rather needlessly elaborates it in a way which causes an enormous credibility gap even if it is true. Things like this leave Jim open to destruction by the news media anytime they seriously study his claims, and their attacks in such an instance would be justified.

- h. Check to see if Turner had anything to do with the "code" (address book-- "coded" version of Ruby's telephone #) since that is one of the most destructive things Jim has maintained publicly, and it served to embarrass and discredit our most powerful ally in Congress, Russell of Louisiana, and hurt us all over. It is in the Ramparts article. No one in their right mind could have voiced it as a possibility of high proportions. Let's face it, LHO had Hosty's name in his book, Shaw had Layten Marten's (Ferrie's roommate's) phone in his book, and Ruby's book in the Archives has pages O and S missing, suggesting the possibility that he had Shaw and LHO in his. Ruth Paine has "LHO purchase of rifle" on her calendar. There is no need of code, and it had a low probability of being coded anyway. Ironically, the "code" speculation destroyed the fact that both men having the same number in their book is an incredible coincidence even if you don't know exactly why. So this turned a good piece of evidence into something destructive of Garrison, and something which almost deal him a final blow. So, I don't know whether Turner was in on it, but check this out because Turner has spoken to people about it and I'm pretty sure used it in Ramparts.
- i. Notice that he and Boxley do the same thing. They sit around and absorb Jim's material and encourage him on things which will hurt in the end, but give little or nothing in return. In the case of Boxley I don't know for sure, but when I was there last March Boxley was mostly vague and didn't come across so well in regard to either my requests or Harold's.
4. Has he done anything which could hurt the CIA? NO, quite the opposite. He has rendered many attacks against them subject to attack by the press and public. More important, he has focused the assassination stuff away from them. The big article on Garrison quotes Garrison on the front cover as accusing LBJ, and inside repeats the thing on LBJ and concluded that the minutemen did it. He lets the CIA and military off entirely in that article. Read it through again if what I am writing sounds incredible--he lets them off Scott Free--not even CBS did that, and he throws up a red herring of minutemen, etc. The LBJ thing, of course, is even worse, since everyone saw that cover, even if they didn't read the article. The charge on the cover is untrue and at best is a cheap ploy to try to get Johnson to re-open the case, which he is not going to due through any sort of pressure, let along an article like that. But worst of all, no mention of CIA. As the critic who probably does the most public speaking on this issue (unless someone can beat a minimum of 3 appearances per week, plus radio, with the appearances often lasting 6 hrs. or more with questions afterwards) I can state clearly that the LBJ involvement myth is a major source of trouble. I spent almost 1/2 hour of a # 3 hr. show (which reaches Canada, as far east as Illinois, and usually Greenland) trying to explain that garbage away. Let's face it, documents are classified by order of the FBI and CIA, and if Johnson was involved it was probably as an accessory after the fact, but at present our evidence indicates principally CIA--military.
5. No one is that dumb or incompetent, not even Mort Sahl or some of the other hangers on down there. And furthermore, Turner is an agent, not just an average guy, and unlike the rest of us had training in this kind of work.
6. I have heard that Turner did real dirty work for the FBI including planting of info with innocent people. If this is true, and I don't recall the sources, then it's hard to believe that he suddenly developed a new set of ethics. This is not like Donald Duncan who quit the Green Berets because of an intellectual awakening.
7. A key point which can't be emphasized too much is have either Boxley or Turner produced anything of importance themselves which can be verified. Opening up new

areas of the case which can't be checked out except through other unreliable sources doesn't count. The latter is particularly important since we know that he has helped lead the thing astray before with loss of time, money, and allowing of attacks on Jim.

Turner has not helped at all with Rose and no one will provide a picture. I don't care if he does admit the Mexico thing, I want a photo to show to the girls if for no other reasons than a check out of the whole story and to see if his appearance has changed.

By now Vince you know that I am not a paranoid, and in fact sometimes, to your disgust, reach the hardheaded other extreme. I was right about Gurvich, reasoning on the basis of how he came to work for Jim and his miraculous successes. I was (I think) right about Rose, and at the very least caught him in the act of a major indiscretion. I was also right in the case of Nagell and Kroman and it was I who worked tirelessly at proving it, even at the risk of my professional future in getting the medical records (which, by the way, the theft from Garrison's files now threatens, after the faking of my apartment failed). I am certainly not claiming infallibility, but my mistakes in spotting agents are few.

I have 3 new pieces of info: 1. Roger Craig's aunt who I will see--find out about his son so I can get her

2. A incident involving Roger Crookshank--I will tell you later but I must know if Jim knows of him or was after him. If so, I either have an important new piece of info or an agent on the line. I will have a photo and handwriting sample.

3. A Ruby letter--one of the ones from the auction

I have written to Barbara Bolden and may have another way into Springfield now besides her. Fran Galt had some interesting comments on the MLK death. Because of his last name, the FBI checked him out in Wisconsin, prior to checking out his parents in Birmingham and without (they claim) knowing that he had parents in the south. This was before they publicly used the name Eric Starvo Galt. The Southern offices were apparently doing nothing, which is not surprising knowing how racist they are by comparison to many of the northern offices. They got his name from a phone book, and claimed that hadn't even checked their files to see if he was in them, which he was as a draft resister who had been imprisoned in Springfield. This was who I cryptically mentioned on the phone. He is a great guy as you know from his letter which I sent you a copy of. He cares more about Abe than the case, which is something I like.

I've got to go now. Working day and night, both on the new film Harold got, on new leads, on making more slides, and on public speaking. Good luck in N.O.--you are the only one who has a chance. Take care, if we are right you may be in some danger.

*Cont. on back -*

MEDICAL SCHOOL  
DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHIATRY AND NEUROLOGY  
MINNEAPOLIS, MINNESOTA 55455

November 28, 1968

Dear Vince,

Some thoughts which didn't get into my last letter in my haste to mail it: I think that Turner in no way compares to Thompson. Thompson's book (I can't judge his public appearances since I haven't heard them) has helped convince many people about the case. The only really negative thing in it is the explaining away of the bullet 399 as planted, and that weakened the book since no one who I have spoken with believed it. It is a shame that he said nothing about the false Oswald, the dishonest investigation, etc. also, of course, and that the government therefore got off easily. But the net result, no matter what Tink's objectives, was to convince people that the case needs re-opening and that Garrison should be heard in court. Tink also drops food for thought by mentioning the CIA man in Parkland and reprinting the FBI report on Army Intell. man Powell in the TSPD in the back. But Tink did much less damage (if any at all, as opposed to not making a contribution) than guys like George Tompson who are called critics in order to discredit the critics. The best thing the govt. could do is pay for "investigation" by every nut they can find to submerge the critics. Turner is in a different category all together for the following reasons:

1. Had Jim's chalk talk become a press conference, it could have completely destroyed him and us (who stand with him), perhaps for good, in the eyes of many including average citizens, congressmen, and the part of the press which still hasn't made up its mind. It could have been the end of much of what we have worked for.

2. Turner, through incompetence, or on purpose, has caused the waste of an incredible amount of time and money through pursuit of false leads.

3. He has submerged what we know of Dealy Plaza and Clay Shaw and the old evidence, all of which is solid, hard, and convincing to the public and even much of the press, in spectacular new info which can't be verified except through other new finds, all of dubious validity. He has jumped at things like Nagell and Underhill and given the Epsteins and other lickspittle prostitutes much to use against Jim. Much of this kind of info Jim would be skeptical about and not use publicly accept for the fact that he has "experienced ex-federal agents," assumedly as good as anyone on the other side, patting him on the back and telling him that this stuff is real. Whether or not you or Jim accept my rejection of it, bear in mind that it should be treated with suspicion and not used publicly. Such use would have the same effect as Rita Rollen's stuff or Potem's running Jim for President. Even if true, much of this stuff is not for current public consumption, anymore than Romney's brainwashing charge was.

4. Turner has always defended suspected agents--Boxley, Rose, Potem, etc.--in every case! He has gone out of his way, perhaps dishonestly, to back them up as in the case of Potem. In the case of Rose he has quite clearly defended them. It does not matter that in questionable hero worshippers such as Steve Burton and the West Coast crew back all of this up, since they are easily led astray and have difficulty in even normal circumstances in evaluating false info. (i.e. The Burton memo on Kroman was a product of all of the cream of the crop from San Francisco.)

This in no way reflects on them but in the situation, especially since what is required is a bit of paranoia and distrust plus the experience which you and I have gained over 4 or 5 years with the case. The story of the burglarized room with Potam and his defense of Rose ~~xxxx~~ are particularly strong points, especially the former, since they are so far out.

5. If Bill Turner were 19 like Steve Burton, this could be explained away at least in part (except for burglarizing the room, etc.), but Turner is a 10 yr. veteran of the FBI and is supposedly tough minded and mature. At best he is totally incompetent and at worst an agent, but in either case his influence over Jim and influence in directing the course of the investigation threatens the whole thing and even Jim's physical safety. Should Jim appear to be a paranoid Schizophrenic to the press and public, any death could be ruled a suicide, and they will get many persons in my profession to come forward and explain it. I myself could lay out exactly how the articles would read, and will do it if you are curious. Epstein has already laid the groundwork.

Although I am probably in the doghouse down there, if they even remember who I am, point out my experiences in trying to defend Garrison in the face of the Ramparts article accusing Johnson on the cover and the minutemen inside. Point out that the press is not hopelessly against us and the people certainly aren't. Point out that even congressmen can be reached. But, point out that we have them cold because of what happened in Dealy Plaza and what happened afterward. Because of this, despite the fear in their hearts, they should pray that Jim has something. Secondly, we have them through Ferrie, Shaw, et. al. in New Orleans. But, Nagell, Crisman, etc. add nothing and greatly increase the credibility gap. No plot of this sort could ever surface in such a manner with Nagell and Crisman being known to us. This is fantasy and wishful thinking. If, after (producing Dealy Plaza) and producing Shaw et. al. there appears to be enough evidence to verify Crisman, Nagell, et. al., then by all means bring it out, but only after a solid base has been established. As a parallel case, what would have happened if there were no critics and Garrison came out of the blue? Off to the nuthouse I can assure you. Take the case of Harrison Salisbury as an example--even foreign knowledge of the bombing didn't help him, despite his position in American journalism. I think that this is an important and basic element of strategy which should be obvious to anyone. And it is not only those who read and believe pen prostitutes like Epstein who will not believe such fantastic stories. Again, not as a psychologist in training do I speak, but as someone who presents the case to people every day of the week. (Bear in mind that my presentations usually last 6 hrs with questions so that I am not relying on rhetoric or personal impression, but logic. This is true even on the radio since I am never on for less than 3 hrs. at a time.)

Turner gains much from his association with Jim and at the very least gets free info for his Ramparts stuff. But what does he really contribute which holds up. Most of it is unconfirmed, except by other new sources. This is not the same, needless to say, as Harold learning something new from Pena or Jim learning something new from a new witness such as Russo.

I am firmly convinced that he is an agent. If not, he is doing more than any agent known to me, or all agents combined, to hurt this investigation at all levels--from the credibility of Jim, credibility of the case, best use of time and money, best directions for investigation, etc. If he were only a Josiah Thompson, I would not worry. If Tink were in New Orleans he would be similar to Bethell--of limited usefulness and of hindrance in that facts are not recognized as important because he is not looking for the big conspiracy, but the investigation would progress at least in a few solid directions and there would be no credibility gap nor would Jim be in as vulnerable a position. The problem is, that agent or not, Turner has worked his way in with Jim in a manner in which persons like ourselves cannot, by continually reinforcing him or not. If I had been in position to do so, when that code thing came up I would have told him that it was nonsense and had hurt the investigation almost

immeasurably. I refused to believe it at first, thinking that the media had misreported. I sympathized with Russell Long in the Senate trying to explain it.

The inaccuracies in Turner's work make Thompson's look like nothing, and in the case of Thompson at least the reader is free to reject his ideas. In Turner's case they are "facts," and certainties. Thompson is guilty of no really easy to prove direct dishonesty or false reporting, although he shades some of his presentation of the facts. Nobody draws on Thompson's work to destroy Jim, attack the credibility of the critics, or attempt an Epstein type apology for the government. Tink's work can be explained on the basis of a sincere desire to compromise in the process of trying to give the establishment and intellectuals one last chance to act (i.e. "a microstudy of the evidence yields new facts").

I hope that Garrison's suppeaning of Crisman doesn't lead to trouble.

New Info of interest:

1. Ruth Paine: In regard to the notation on Ruth Paine's calendar, I think I forgot to refer you to XVII, p56--the full notation isn't clearly what the Commission asks Marina about (XXII, p196), since the beginning may not be "Oct 23"--what is important is that the notation is on the month of March and Kleins received LHO's order on March 13 and sent it on March 20!  
also, see XVII, 179-96--Ruth really puts the old frame on LHO, pats the FBI on the back with the most disgusting outpouring of praise, and pins the commie label on Lee--on p193 Ruth assumes he is dead at the first mention that he was shot in the head and begins offering prayer--no one else did that This short writing of hers is a dead giveaway, especially for someone supposedly big on civil liberties
2. James Garrett--allegedly said that he would kill JFK if given the chance--left Laredo on Nov.20 without any notice, after watching his mail closely 2-3 days prior to his departure--makes frequent visits to Mexico--died allegedly of a heart attack on April 16, 1964--FBI reports on him very short
3. Fingerprints from FPCC leafletting of N.O. waterfront were not LHO's!
4. Re: Mohammed Reggab (of whom I now have photos and FBI reports)--If his claims are true, according to memo of feb.7, "a drastic change in previous evaluations of Marina Oswald-will be required." Sounds interesting because of the wording.

Best of Luck in New Orleans. Will see you over Christmas.

*Ray*