

2/8/73

Dear Sylvia

It seems we are two survivors of the battle for truth in the assassination of Pres. J.F. Kennedy. Many have left the battlefield or "defected" to the "official" side. But there must be others unknown to us. And some who persist in their own fashion, even if it is not in our ways. Time is a great sorter-out and effects many surprises. It is not precluded we will yet see pleasant developments to compensate us, so to speak, for the disappointments of warriors grown weary or corrupted.

I remind myself I have not acquainted you with the outcome of my "relationship" with Sprague and with Computers and Automation. It bears out your judgment these people are

impossible.

You recall I had difficulty obtaining copies of C + A. I was determined not to buy them at the exorbitant price put on them by

Berkeley. In the end he loosened up and I received a goodly number of issues, some implacably duplicated. Letters from

Jacque put emphasis on his initial articles in C + A which I read closely. In one exchange I asked him for the data,

not contained or even referred to in his articles, on which he based the flat statement Oswald was a government agent.

His reply was unsatisfactory. He cited but did not quote a document in Garrison's files. At the same time he urged me

to inspect the Dix film he had no opportunity, he said, for years

to view. I neither answered his letter nor went to see the film.

I suppose Prague turned me off. Perhaps some day in the spring I'll try to see it.

Among the issues Berkeley sent me were three containing installments of an article published in the Soviet press attributing responsibility for the assassination to Lyndon B. Johnson. The concluding installment or installments I never paid. I wrote to Berkeley asking for an opportunity to analyze the Soviet journalists' "analysis." He did not reply.

As for my own piece - ha! You remember, ^{initially} (he wanted my letter to Salandria recast as an article. To my inquiry as to length and deadline he made no reply. Months passed. Wallace was shot. I wrote to Salandria and sent Berkeley a copy. Some time later a note arrived from Berkeley paying three copies

of the issue containing my "article" were on the way to me. I assumed he had recast my long letter to Salandria and had published it. When C & A arrived I was surprised to see he had abridged my letter to Salandria about Wallace shooting and had published it as an article without my consent or even informing me in advance of publication. Ironically, it is the only thing I have had published in the near-decade since the assassination.

In further contact with Berkeley, he said he still wanted the original Salandria piece and finally gave me a deadline which made the earliest practical publication the November, 1972 issue. I suggested the piece be written as an anniversary article and encompass analysis of Salandria's speech. He

agreed. I sent him a manuscript in the last week of
September, 1972, in time to make the Oct. & deadline for
the November issue.

I heard nothing. Months later, watching Earl Warren being
interviewed on TV, I reminded myself I had had no word from
Berkeley and wrote him asking whether he had published
the piece or, if not, whether he intended to.

He replied fairly promptly. If I remember accurately - I
filed his letter and am too lazy to retrieve it - his letter made
no specific replies to my questions - His letter was couched in
general terms. He wrote that ^{he had read} the various pieces I had sent
him, four in number I think, and had filed them under
"Consider" for possible future publication which I take to be

unwisely because, he wrote, it is the policy of C + A to publish factual material rather than rhetoric into which category my pieces fell.

That left me with the unanswerable proposition that Salandria's fantasies, Sprague's bald assertion, and the Soviet journalist's wild accusations were publishable as factual material, whereas Stamm's political analysis is unpublishable because it is rhetoric.

I did not bother to write to Berkeley.

Yours
/

May sends her best.

We both intend to see you when the weather improves.