

813-
347-8644

29 September 1968

Dear Sylvia:

First, I received your letter of the 10th and the copy of your letter to Steffen. Time gets away from me before I know it. I did write to you last week and then things happened that made the letter unimportant so here I am again. Sorry for being so tardy.

Second, please, never apologize for short letters or notes or for the haste that I realize is so necessary. None of these offends me nor do I feel that you are 'short-changing' me. Aside from working full time you have other and more important demands on your time. While I love to receive long letters and would prefer that kind every day, it would be presumptive of me to expect them. When I have asked something that needed a reply, you have responded and that is the important thing. So let's hear no more apologies, particularly about something about which I am not complaining.

It may be hard to believe that I still have not played over the Lane tape to see exactly what he did say. Nor have I replayed the Penn Jones tape. Steffen writes that it was his impression that Jones has retreated somewhat and does not sound the same.

Just as I was becoming concerned about not hearing from Steffen for nearly two weeks I received a note, all of four lines, yesterday in which he says he has not been feeling well. Since he never complains, I think he must have been feeling worse than he indicated.

About Steffen. So far as I am able to understand what he has written to me, it seems that Epstein's apparent acceptance of the WR was what set him off and made him change his mind since I had understood him to agree with your criticism of Garrison. In reply to his criticism of Epstein, I suggested re-reading the letters you had sent to him and he agreed to do so.

I don't think Steffen still places Garrison so high on the scale as he did, not nearly. But it was Epstein that undid things. And I think Steffen expected Arnoni to refute what Epstein wrote except for criticisms of Garrison and he did not feel Arnoni had done so.

The reference to 'whispered things' was unfortunate. The implication is not the same as what he really means. Some background on the term might help. Way back when he and I were continually arguing over UFO stands, as taken by various groups and individuals, we were discussing some of the incidents that were open to question. Steffen is open and aboveboard. He is for complete freedom of information and can see no reason for withholding anything from the public. In some UFO investigations there have been details never before encountered and researchers have felt this kind of data might be of more value if kept as a kind of check should there be later reports containing the same details. In this way they would be certain the more recent observer did not merely repeat something he had read before.

Footprint patterns reportedly left by UFO occupants fell into this category as did any alleged writings. This paid off in the case of John Reeves' landing/occupant report of March 1965. APRO had retained sketches and descriptions of both prints and writings from earlier reports and there was no way John could have known of them. When they matched on enough points, both the earlier reports and John's had to be

given more serious consideration than they would have been otherwise. The same kind of comparison was applied to the description of the creature John encountered.

In a similar way other reports have been discounted. Descriptions to be used for such correlation were available to other researchers but were not made public so that they were known to very few individuals. This is the kind of thing that Steffen regards as 'whispered things'. Any confidential information is, to Steffen, a 'whispered thing' and the term is not meant to be derogatory when the origin of the term, as used by him, is known.

At one point in our discussion of the position you have taken - this was following Epstein's article - I suggested to Steffen that, even if the reasons published by you and by Epstein did not seem strong enough for him, it could well be that either or both of you might be in possession of even stronger arguments that could not be revealed but which served to make you sure of your stand. I had forgotten how he would be sure to regard this or I would never have written it.

After reading over Steffen's letter to Arnoni for the umpteenth time, I am wondering if he had read your article when he wrote. I don't think so. It is characteristic of Steffen to start at the beginning of the magazine and read one thing after another, rather than selecting what he will read first (as I do - I read your article first). He would then proceed to react to Arnoni and write to him before going on to the next item and I believe this is what he must have done.

I do want to compliment you on your letter to Steffen. Sometimes I get riled beyond words and cannot respond to my own satisfaction. One good thing about Steffen, when he is slapped down and stops to think things over carefully, he does not hesitate to admit he has been wrong. He does insist upon absolutely air-tight arguments, seizing upon any loophole he can find as proof that the entire argument is worthless. If he is to be persuaded to change his mind, he wants the persuasion to be stated in the strongest possible way.

The first part of the fourth paragraph, last page of your letter to Steffen, seems to explain what I have gone all around saying. He wanted Arnoni to criticize Epstein in way -- miserable telephone, lost my thought. Anyway, he expected such perfection from Arnoni (superhuman, I think), wanting Epstein put down and the WR and Garrison both revealed as sheer idiocy.

Anyway, if either of us has misread Steffen's letter to Arnoni, he will certainly make it known when he replies to you. He would also be furious if he knew I even attempted what I suppose is some kind of defense. So I won't let him know. I do hope Mr. Arnoni comes down on him hard if he replies. Kid-glove treatment is not acceptable to Steffen and does not gain his respect.

Thank you for the information on Arnoni. I have not yet been in touch with Bob Ruark; he will be ready to arrange for guests in a few days. I hope he has Arnoni on soon so TMC may gain some new subscribers.

Enclosed is a copy of an article that appeared in Penabaz' publication and should be taken as any other product of his mind. Perhaps the plants in your window-box need fertilizing.

Ed Horsey. Probably, you know more about him than I do and I would appreciate enlightenment. Whatever you can tell me will be held in confidence. I have seen

him on two half-hour TV interviews in addition to his radio guest-shot. I had mixed feelings about him until he phoned one day and talked more freely. As is my habit, I did not express any opinion on Garrison, trying to keep in the middle until I could discover his position and, more important, the reasons for such a position. My first impression was that he was unsure of Garrison but was a little inclined to go along with him on the basis of not knowing what evidence Garrison actually has.

When Ed visited me for a couple of hours, after we had talked for a bit, I said I thought he should know that you did not agree with Garrison and this seemed to be a secret pass-word or something. Since then, according to talks on the phone, he has seemed to become even more convinced Garrison is a nut. When he contacted Kerry Thornley, I suggested he ask you for advice and also that he relate other things about which he had told me. I have seen copies of letters he wrote to RFK but I have not seen any from RFK to him except for one that did not seem to refer to anything in particular. He also says he had talked with Sen. Kennedy (Robert) on more than one occasion - maybe you know about it.

I sure wish I knew more about him. He professes to agree with you about Russo and Clay Shaw. Says he has read everything he could that you have written. But at the same time he has gone along with Mark Lane - until the past few days. There are so many variables and things that are not what they seem that I do not trust myself to make correct judgments, not based on the knowledge I have - I don't have enough.

The other day I told Ed about Lifton's book but I don't think he heard when I said you told me. For weeks there has been a lot of unnecessary noise on my phone and it often distorts. It was fixed Thursday. Thank goodness.

I have sent Ed a copy of your article in the last TMO. I had read a part of it to him on the phone, the part about Jones Harris.

I think that just about covers everything. Hope you can tell me Ed Horsey is O.K. as he impresses me as being. He seems to have gained Thornley's trust, according to his own reports.

Now I must finish up the October UFO thing. The deadline was yesterday! The delay was caused by the very person who is waiting for it. That is justice. Don't look for anything wonderful. It is mostly for people who don't have access to any other publications and if they don't report local sightings we can't publish them. So, no local reports. And I am going to lay low for awhile before I use anything original. If I ever do again.

Please take care of yourself. We need you.

Love,

Helen