

8 February 1971

Dear Tink,

Many thanks for the Jack Anderson clippings, which I have xeroxed for myself and am returning herewith. How sordid, and how exasperating. A man as shrewd and suspicious as Anderson should have progressed beyond naive belief in the sacrosanctity of the WR, and also beyond the mere "backfire" theory which was first expounded by Mark Lane in the LA Free Press, as I recall it -- a long article, published not long before RPK was assassinated himself, in which Lane posed the question "Could RPK have been plagued by the thought that the CIA plots which he must at least have condoned put into motion forces that may have brought about his brother's martyrdom?" (Of course it took only hours after RPK's death for Lane to rally and produce fictional accounts of how RPK had sent emissaries to Garrison---to help to unearth those forces whose setting into motion he had himself condoned???)

Since Anderson juxtaposes in the 1/19/71 column the possibility that the CIA might have tried to assassinate "other leaders" -- of whom JFK was one -- and JFK's intention to splinter the CIA in a thousand pieces, he might have considered the logic of cause and effect in the context he himself poses. Instead, he hypothesizes "fiendish tortures" of the would-be CIA assassins. Presumably they provided Castro with a blueprint for Dallas? without which Castro would have been helpless? And was Castro so eager to have LBJ instead of JFK---despite the secret negotiations via Daniel?

As you say, the whole thing does ring true, but not as Anderson reconstructs it. Maybe he does understand the more logical product of his 2 + 2 but is too chicken to verbalize it. A child of six, I think, would easily follow where these facts truly lead...

Like you, I have been staggering under a bigger workload than I expected. My boss got back from a month at Geneva and it took him just one day to throw the whole office here into consternation and anarchy. Instead of being free to catch up with my official reading (stack of at least three feet of documents) I found myself going to three different sets of meetings in as many days, without prior notice or any acquaintance with the subject matter---having to speak quite frequently in one of the meetings---and of course write reports. Plus which, I am doing a free-lance index for a book on UFOs which was written by Paris Flammonde. After his rhapsodic and fatuous book on Garrison, it was a pleasant surprise to find that this work is objective, well-reasoned, and well-written. With one thing and another, I've been rushing from one foolish activity to another. Well, at least there is no time to brood on the really awful state of the world. It will be great fun when we finally get together---soon, I hope. Much love to you and Nancy and the young,

Ever,