

When you get to New York, let's be sure to spend an evening together.
Meanwhile, stay in touch, and my warmest regards to your wife and young kids
and to the Hartmanns when you see them next.
As always,

17 May 1969

Dear Kerry,

Good to hear from you. I had assumed the new duties of fatherhood were taking up your time. Your turkey letterhead is, by the way, delightful.

I am very glad that you and Helen Hartmann have hit it off so well. Has good old Hersey vanished entirely from the scene? Helen does some very good (rational) work on UFOs but I am sorry to hear that she thinks they are Controlling the World. As a matter of fact, I have found it ironic and extraordinary in the 20 years or so that I have monitored ufology writing and research how little these "flying Saucers" (which seem indisputably to be solid, real objects of non-terrestrial character) intrude into human affairs. They seem adamantly to avoid any contact or sustained attempt to communicate; and while humans who view them are temporarily electrified by the experience, it blows over (usually one sighting to a customer, and while there are numerous witnesses in absolute numbers, they are still a fairly small proportion of the population at any one moment in time). Consequently, the government was able to use the WR technique to "dispose" of the problem--the infamous Condon Report, whose contents despite very careful selection with intent to deceive still prove the "conclusions" to be the usual hogwash.

Despite my deep involvement in the WR affair for all these years, I have suffered no wire-tap, mail interception, or UFO intervention. I can't understand why I should be left out in the cold, when Helen is getting the full treatment (and I would not dismiss her allegations at all, I think she is basically too rational to fantasize the whole thing) and when another WR researcher who writes to me from time to time, from Minnesota, has documented evidence of similar telephone and mail interference. (Although this fellow lives alone, a stranger sometimes answers his phone, he tells me, pretending to be his "roommate"--he has even called his own number and had the "roommate" answer, which was rather a chilling experience.)

I remember only one instance in Accessories in which I refer to failure to correct an erroneous press report, and that related to Captain Fritz and his description of the "unusual, undetermined caliber" of the rifle. True, the ordinary obscure individual cannot get a misstatement corrected; but the chief of homicide certainly can, by a phonecall or a press release or a press conference. If there are other instances which escape me now, I imagine they involve similarly high-placed persons, as I would not have expected a Book Depository laborer or an eyewitness who happened to be at Dealey Plaza to be able to persuade a paper to correct a misquotation.

Incidentally, re: the sub-chapter in Accessories in which I suggest that Charles Givens' story of meeting Oswald at 11:55 a.m. on the 6th floor was pure perjury and probably in collusion with the police--(and please regard this as absolutely confidential)--I have recently seen a document from the Archives which bears that out. More than that, the document indicates that not only did Givens not return to the 6th floor and not meet Oswald there but that his original story actually placed Oswald on the 1st floor at noon, as several others also placed him. What is so scandalous about this is that the lawyer who took Givens' testimony was fully aware of his original story, and allowed him to give totally different testimony without even a question on his self-contradiction. (over)

When you do get to New York, let's be sure to spend an evening together. Meanwhile, stay in touch, and my warm gettings to your wife and young Kreg and to the Hartmanns when you see them next.

As always,

17 May 1969

Dear Kelly,

Good to hear from you. I had assumed the new duties of fatherhood were taking up your time. Your turkey letterhead is, by the way, delightful.

I am very glad that you and Helen Hartmann have hit it off so well. Has good old Henry vanished entirely from the scene? Helen sees some very good (rational) work on UFOs but I am sorry to hear that she thinks they are controlling the world. As a matter of fact, I have found it ironic and extraordinary in the 20 years or so that I have monitored ufology writing and research how little these "flying saucers" (which seem indisputably to be solid, real objects of non-terrestrial character) intrude into human affairs. They seem adamantly to avoid any contact or sustained attempt to communicate; and while humans who view them are temporarily electrified by the experience, it blows over (usually one sighting to a customer, and while there are numerous witnesses in absolute numbers, they are still a fairly small proportion of the population at any one moment in time). Consequently, the government was able to use the WR technique to "dispose" of the problem--the infamous Gordon Report, whose contents despite very careful selection with intent to deceive still prove the "conclusions" to be the usual nonsense.

Despite my deep involvement in the WR affair for all these years, I have suffered no wire-tap, mail interception, or UFO intervention. I can't understand why I should be left out in the cold, when Helen is getting the full treatment (and I would not dismiss her allegations at all, I think she is basically too rational to fantasize the whole thing) and when another WR researcher who writes to me from time to time, from Minnesota, has documented evidence of similar telephone and mail interference. (Although this fellow lives alone, a stranger sometimes answers his phone, he tells me, pretending to be his "roommate"--he has even called his own number and had the "roommate" answer, which was rather a chilling experience.)

I remember only one instance in accessories in which I refer to failure to correct an erroneous press report, and that related to Captain Fritz and his description of the "unusual, undetermined caliber" of the rifle. True, the ordinary obscure individual cannot get a misstatement corrected; but the chief of homicide certainly can, by a phonecall or a press release or a press conference. If there are other instances which escape me now, I imagine they involve similarly high-placed persons, as I would not have expected a Book Depository laborer or an eyewitness who happened to be at Daley Plaza to be able to persuade a paper to correct a misquotation.

Incidentally, re: the sub-chapter in accessories in which I suggest that Charles Givens' story of meeting Oswald at 11:25 a.m. on the 6th floor was pure perjury and probably in collusion with the police--(and please regard this as absolutely confidential)--I have recently seen a document from the Archives which bears that out. More than that, the document indicates that not only did Givens not return to the 6th floor and not meet Oswald there but that his original story actually placed Oswald on the 1st floor at noon, as several others also placed him. What is so scandalous about this is that the lawyer who took Givens' testimony was fully aware of his original story, and allowed him to give totally different testimony without even a question on his self-contradiction. (over)