

1/26/71

Dick (Sylvia, Howard),

Your 1/14 and 1/18 arrived today. With the continuation of my legal education, which really meaning learning that there is virtually no such things as an honest lawyer, I have a few minutes before a hasty lunch. Aside from the enormity of irrelevancies the government just heaped on me for the clothing/pix suit, requiring considerable checking and research, I've just spent the morning responding to an indecency by a liberal lawyer who represents a bastard who is trying to beat me out of \$1,000 he owes me. It does not leave me in a good mood, but it also does not leave me in the proper frame of mind for thinking and working.

I think you'd earlier sent me a copy of your 1/17 to Hock. Paul was here during the summer recess, to attend some scientific function in DC and to remain to work at the Archives. Knowing he planned to come, I'd arranged for him to be able to stay with Bud. He did. He, undoubtedly met Sprague there.

Sprague, as you and Sylvia both agree, is a real nice guy. I suspect you also agree that he is as extreme and far-out as one can get. He also confabulates more than most, as I know from my own experiences with him. One of the larger drains on my emotions and times was his fecal treatment of the "tramp" pictures and the impression he made on Garrison with them. From this I learned that to this very nice guy truth is what he wills it to be, not what it is. So, while admitting that I am entirely without any one explanation that satisfies me about PH's recent past, I am also not willing to take what boils down to Sprague's interpretation of their conversation. Mary may have been right in chiding me for trusting just about everybody, but I remain unconvinced that Paul has joined "the other side". And I can present arguments nobody else has to say that he has. I just don't believe it. Because I am so unequivocal, you'll have no trouble chiding me if it turns out I'm wrong.

Speaking of Garrison, I've had to let my N.O. subscriptions lapse, for both time and money. This a.m.'s Post says that Willis Robertson says he borrowed \$30,000 for Jim and that it has been neither repaid nor accounted for. I believe both, but if not accounted for, it is because he didn't ask. That money was in a separate account and Jim was not the one who drew checks against it. I suspect I can pretty well account for its uses, which makes me interested in anything anyone may see in any papers. If I do not believe that Jim was an agent of any kind, a charge that can be supported by reasonable arguments by those who do not know that strange cat personally, and I do not believe Boxley or Turner were, nonetheless know that he is susceptible to certain kinds of influences and I do not regard the entire matter as closed. I do not share my suspicions, which have no factual basis but are not, in my opinion, irrational or unreasonable, and I ask for all information, no matter how seemingly inconsequential. I heard from Louis Iven last week, rather I phoned him and he said he was about to phone me about a personal as distinguished from what he regarded as an office matter. As of then, for the current proceedings, these accounts were being audited. That money cut off, by the way, about the time of the NBC/ CBS agnup.

On your monograph: at the time he had a draft of The Bastard Bullet, I encouraged Ray Marcus to enlarge, improve and cleanse it, even offering the services of my own artist and printer. I was then for publication of every such item study that could be made. I recognize that I may be wrong, but I believe that today our best course is to not do one-shots, that each thing we publish should be in either a context of to a special audience. If you seek publication in a journal of gunnery (and NRA should be approached), I'm all for it. But if in the general press, I'm probably have misgivings. I think that today we need something overwhelming or should be silent. Thus my own silences, and I could still get radio time whenever I seek it. But, you do your thing. You are quite right in not rushing, and every not must be advance-picked. I find it, as you know, persuasive. The only court use I could make I should make explicit: I plan what I call a "panel" suit. I'd have filed it a year ago if Bud had kept his word(s). Now I'm not hurrying and thing there must be certain other work done. I'm in even less of a rush than you on this. However, the use I think I had in mind is perhaps the best possible: with the mediwhores on the witness stand. ...Right to let PH cool for a while and observe. Hastily, HW