

Dear Sylvia,

11/18/70

The arrival of your letters of the 15th to Garrison and the 16th to Hoch is timely, as the enclosed shows. I wrote Paul again this morning.

I have no copy of Garrison's book and I cannot justify buying it at this time, our finances being, as the passing of time makes inevitable slightly poorer. Eventually, I believe, one of the many friendly strangers with whom I correspond will send me his copy after proper regurgitation. From my knowledge of him, I'd estimate it to be a very well written generality, with slight specification, and close to total avoidance of the Shaw case and either no or next to no content of any New Orleans investigation, the latter because he, simply, made no (I did). I would guess, considering how much work I did there and how much of his generality undoubtedly originated with me, that there will be no mention of me and my work or close to it. Perhaps, some day, you will feel that you can maintain in confidence what I would tell you, and then I will. I presume the book went on sale in advance of pub date, for your letter is dated the day before it was supposed to appear. I never hear from any of them. I have written several letters for information they ultimately promised, after much persuasion on my part, and never did. Because he owes me money and because I gave him several hundred copies of my books, I presume Jim will not send me one of his. All of this is, I think, a greater tragedy than you have any way of realizing and also a different kind. However, I do not think his was a deliberate misquotation of your book. I know the painful way he writes, honing with great effort, all in longhand on ruled yellow pads. I've seen it. I think this was just a mistake, not intended. Your reserve, however, is as remarkable as it is commendable. I do not often find it possible, where I feel as deeply about anything as I know you do of this, to achieve such restraint.

On Paul, yours is an excellent letter with a fine approach.

Let me go back to Jim a minute. If you find other errors, I am establishing a file on this book for several reasons, including ultimate archival value. Had it been necessary, I was prepared to do a special, fast book titled "Lemming". I doubt it will be called for or worthwhile, and the legitimate criticism, for which so many of our "colleagues" are so largely responsible, will go uncollected, except in files.

The third and fourth paragraphs of your letter to Paul are brilliant. There may be some significance in the fact I had missed, that this seems to be the first thing he has done in connection with publication, I think he claims he never intended publication, but that does not separate it from Alvarez'. I remain without any explanation of this so out-of-character thing from Paul. I cannot conceive of him as some kind of agent, and he denies pressure. What remains includes the possibility of illness. This I ask you not to discuss with anyone. I am taking steps to see if I can explore the possibility. There is no doubt in my mind, again not for bruiting about, that Garrison and Salandria are ill, and I suspect others may be, from my contact with them. I suppose this is a field in which it may more readily develop. As with Vince, if I find credible support for this, I will let you know. I know Paul as a fine, bright, selfless young man, and this is entirely inconsistent with anything I know of him, including the care of his earlier statements, particularly when I

sought them about my own, unpublished work. He was always ultra-conservative and painstakingly careful. This is slop, unlike him, unlike science, unworthy of even an uninformed man of any kind of science, so I remain perplexed.

By the way, no response yet from Physics Today. Given A's reputation, I presume they communicated with him. And I would still expect Paul to let us know if he knows of imminent publication. I do not think A will undertake that now. If he does, then he has to be serving other purposes.

I have today received a copy of the order, drafted (so very expeditiously) by the US Atty's office in DC. When I get the transcript I'll be sending a copy to Mary for duplication and redistribution, for any who want it. While this is now a public document (as is also the WR material) I ask that one thing in it not be used, and that I inform you of now. I want, having gone to this great cost and trouble to have obtained it, to reserve first use of it for myself and my present intention is to use it in the appeal. I'll be going into it and other things in detail when I prepare a memo on the transcript so that we can all benefit from the mistakes - not for purposes of personal criticism, for the responsibility, ultimately, must be mine, even though what happened is what I anticipated and sought to counter in advance, with futility.

The US Atty argued that the Attorney General had determined that what I sought, the spectrographic analyses, had to be withheld in the national interest! This is, of course, official confirmation of the doctrine so many of us held and hold. That it is specifically prohibited under the law is an added touch. The AG's "determination" and "national interest" are direct quotes. From her on it depends upon the nature of the panel that will consider the appeal. I believe the order is so general that it opens 100% of what was said in court and done there (a nasty smear of Bud he accepted in silence, saying later he hadn't understood it @ which is possible - he is slow in court) and 100% of what is in the various papers filed, which includes gross deception of the judge. With the appeal it will be different. I have Bud's agreement, for whatever that is worth, that we will go over the appeal with great care. It will enable the making of a court record that will have to be answered in court of deliberate deception and misrepresentation by the FBI. When you read the Williams affidavit you will understand, I am confident. I think it is better that we cool this now, with the rather good ammunition we have for the appeal and the different character of that kind of record and forum, and I would prefer that you not communicate any of this and the transcript to those I do not trust and you appear to. Regardless of reason, I now have evidence that officials who do not trust me ~~in particular~~ have a different attitude toward one of them. I'd rather keep all of this for legal use, where, if none of it is telegraphed in advance, it may have more impact.

Sincerely,

