

28 June 1966

Dear Dave,

Thank you for your letter of 24 June with all the interesting news items. I have to congratulate myself, and to thank you again, for arranging to extricate the photocopy of my MS from the clutches of Ramparts. Your account of Dave Welsh's phonecall was certainly very arresting, as was your indication of how my MS was to be used, had it not been rescued. At this stage, it does not surprise me that Welsh, knowing that I felt fed up and wished to disassociate myself from his "project," still intended to use my work, without my consent and against my explicit wishes as expressed by telegram on an earlier occasion. That is perfectly consistent with prior indications of Welsh's ethical standards and I am therefore doubly happy that you were willing to help me out by retrieving the material.

Yes, if Ramparts wanted to do some honest labor, the Subject Index would probably serve their purpose equally well. It was, after all, compiled side-by-side with the manuscript, and utilized the same reference materials in most instances. When the Index was finished, I checked it carefully against the manuscript (at the stage it had then reached) and entered any missing citations. Of course, since then I have expanded the manuscript by perhaps some 200 pages of new material. I appreciated your remarks on the chapters you managed to read.

True, Epstein and Cook appear to fall into the same old trap with people like Packer, Kempton, Macdonald, et al, in accepting the so-called "hard evidence" of LHO's guilt or at least guilty involvement. That is a key to their incomplete familiarity with the Hearings and Exhibits. Any real student of the testimony and documents soon discovers how feeble and sometimes even specious the "hard" evidence really is. That failure to make the absolutely comprehensive back-breaking scrutiny and re-scrutiny of the 26 volumes is probably the main factor in the apparent splintering of the anti-WR faction into those who are ready to accept some, if not all, of the Commission's pap, and those who accept none of it.

I am glad to learn that you have a pipeline into Ramparts and that we will not be completely cut off from their activities. Perhaps it will be possible to obstruct any really dangerous moves on their part. The fact that they are relative novices without any real authoritative command of the material constitutes at least a potential danger--indeed, even some of the most expert critics have at times teetered on the edge of utter disaster through oversight or misjudgment. (It was exactly such a crisis that produced my original disgust with Ramparts and Welsh in particular.)

I am delighted that you also retrieved your Dialogue. It is probably too lengthy for the Minority of One but just the same I think you should submit it, there and elsewhere. With the new public interest in the case, perhaps you should think about paperback publication?

No, the Allan Sweatt/Lonnie Hudkins document was never at the Archives. Check Epstein's book; you will see that even the lawyers were not allowed to know all the details. Hoch must have been mistaken in saying that the exhibit was "withdrawn" as I am certain it was never available.

David, I am not planning any visits to the Archives. Perhaps Vince Salandria could help you with CE 893 and the Holland Exhibits? I will of course be interested to hear further news of your work with the photographs, if and when you feel able to write on the subject. Meanwhile, my cordial good wishes, and renewed thanks for your help with the MS. Do please write again and I will try to pass on news as much as possible. As always,

P.S. TIME came out today without the expected review of Epstein's book, for reasons unknown. They had sent photographers to take pictures of him at his home and scheduled a review for this issue. I don't know if they will maintain silence, instead, or maybe do a bigger treatment later on. Maybe they are waiting to see which way the ball bounces? But LOOK did come out with the vicious attack on Inquest written by Fletcher Knebel; you have probably seen it already.