

NEW ADDRESS: Rt. 7, Frederick, Md. 21701

2/27/68

Dear Helen,

Many thanks for your informative letter of 2/24 and enclosures.

While I was in California, Bob Ruark phoned my wife about Thornley's broadcast or complaint, said he'd send me a tape so I could comment, and I've heard nothing since. Perhaps he has decided that with WJ's indictment, the matter should rest there. I don't know. I've thought of phoning him several times, but each time it is close to his air time I get busy and he's on the air before I realize it.

I have no desire to bug him or Thornley. As a matter of fact, before he left Garrison's office after his indictment, Thornley said he'd like to talk to me. Truth is I went looking for him in November and sent him the message through his friend and former "agent" Clint Bolton that I thought it was to his interest to talk to me and I said I'd then relay to Garrison what I learned. I also said I thought it inevitable that Garrison would want his testimony if for no other reason because he had knowledge of Oswald, whether or not (and I thought not) he knew or understood its significance. It is now barns doors and horses. I'd be glad to talk to him, but I cannot afford the toll charges.

If Stefan is doing any work on the radio logs (and what you sent is interesting), perhaps he'd do this additional thing for me in them: note every reference to an arrest or a suspicious person and every one to a weapon. If he has the time to offer an opinion on the significance of the twisting in the Sawyer exhibit, I'd be interested. I want to be able to study it for a while. However, I have put the Thermofax in that place in XXI, and I'm glad to have it.

My concern about the Thornley tape is unrelated to anything he may have said about me. That interests me little. I am interested in what he said, for whether or not what Garrison charges him with is true, there is no doubt in my mind that he has knowledge the significance of which he might not know. So, I want to go over his words carefully. You may recall what I have already found in his testimony. And on the tape and the transcripts, it will be much safer if you send them to me for Garrison. I dubbed the tape you sent me of the TV show and gave that to him and I photocopies the transcript. I also wrote him a memo. There is a very great chance that what you send will get lost once it is in the office and he'll never know about that. I have ways of getting around that. One of his men is going to spend a week here with me soon and I'll hand deliver everything I then have. They are so clogged with work that there is often poor liason within the office. Last week they finally found a memo I left there in December, and they've been knocking themselves out since trying to duplicate that information, without doing it. The tape will be of better quality if made from your original, but I can duplicate it here.

I doubt very much if Pual Scott will respond in any way to what I said, for having had this demonstration of business by Bob Ruark he will assume I'll have the opportunity to comment on anything he says. He's close enough to libel now without running any additional hazard along that line. But please, do, keep me posted.

I'm glad my plug for Penn Jones paid off. He's a very brave, dedicated man.

You are right about my wife, only you understated. Your suspicions re: pains are warranted. If you ever get more firm, I'd be interested. Many thanks,

4666 - 27<sup>th</sup> Ave. No.  
St. Petersburg, Florida 33713  
24 February 1968

Dear Mr. Weisberg:

Your letter came today and the kind words are appreciated. But it is I who owe you a letter, one that I started a couple of times and put aside each time because of interruptions.

I feel very badly about your having to ask for the tape of Kerry Thornley's appearance on Bob's program. There was a misunderstanding on my part or both you and Jim Garrison would have had copies before Thornley's Grand Jury testimony.

Within the next couple of days I will send you the tapes. Please accept my apologies for not having done so without waiting for some third party to do so. The transcript will follow.

When you hear the tape I think you will be reassured. Bob Ruark is very fair and was prepared to correct any incorrect impressions that Thornley expressed. There were some other points that I was able to straighten out and by the time the program was over I believe we had brought Thornley into a more cooperative state of mind for the trip to New Orleans and Mr. Garrison. On this, however, I can only judge by his apparent attitude over the air. He may have changed by the time he got to New Orleans.

Enclosed are the two clippings that were carried in our paper here this week in connection with the perjury charge. On last night's newscast it was stated that he had decided, on advice of counsel, not to fight extradition; however, this is not mentioned in this morning's paper. The Tampa papers probably carry more and I will check with George Foster in Riverview on that.

At the moment I don't recall any newspaper items following his Grand Jury appearance but, since I save newspapers until I cannot get in or out and then cull for items of interest to clip, I will go through the current mountain and send you anything I can find.

By the way, Bob Ruark contacted the newspaper reporter mentioned by a caller during your last visit and offered to let him respond to what you said. The man asked for a tape of the program and promised to be in touch with Bob within a few days. No reply to date. I think that takes care of his credibility. Bob faithfully reported to his radio audience.

Please extend my sympathies to your wife. She sounds to me like a real gem and must resent being unable to give you the help you need. Even with her assistance, there is obviously more than you can handle comfortably. No apologies are even needed when you don't write as you feel you should.

Enclosed is a copy of something Steffen Sorensen worked out on the DPD radio log. He sent me several copies to pass on if no one had figured

it out yet. I have not yet got that far in my study of the testimony, but he tells me that he believes this particular exhibit was used in the mixed up condition in the hearings.

One of the big puzzles to me is Ruth Paine. I cannot believe that a man would leave a telephone number so he could be called if his wife began labor and yet did not stipulate the name by which he was known at that number. Marina's remark that she felt between two (or 22?) fires can be explained no other way. Ruth was also incensed at Oswald's presumption of his own innocence. This is the same Ruth Paine who spoke so well of the ACLU that Oswald became a member and yet she, if we go according to her own testimony, disregarded the premise that the accused should be considered innocent until proven guilty above all others.

While Oswald was still alive and kicking vigorously in the Dallas jail, Ruth Paine destroyed the mail delivered to her address for him and which he had never seen, wrappers intact. She impressed me as being proud of her action and yet, isn't it a federal offense to tamper with another person's mail?

In our garage we have personal effects belonging to some friends, things that have been there for over three years. I, too, respect their privacy and would not dream of poking through them. When I discovered that some items had been left on the floor where they might become damaged in one way or another, however, I did not hesitate to look to see if these were of such a nature that they should be moved. This is not being nosy or prying, it is the prudent thing to do. So then, when a folded and tied blanket was being walked and stepped upon, I simply refuse to accept the notion that Ruth Paine did not investigate to see if there was anything breakable in it. Michael's actions make sense since his mind had provided him with a concept, however vague and subconscious, of what was in that blanket and an acceptance that it would not break.

In your reply to my first letter you remarked that I seemed to be circumlocutious in some respects and courteously refrained from asking any questions. I did not do so from any desire to be mysterious or secretive. A clarification is in order and I am sure you will understand my reasons.

For some years I have been studying the government's handling of the UFO situation. It had become evident that there was more to their attitude than met the eye, something that went far beyond a simple argument as to whether or not such things exist and whether or not people saw what they swore they saw.

My concern was the interest of both the FBI and the CIA and the evidence of their activities in that field at the same time they were vociferously denying any interest and stating that the Air Force had sole responsibility. One example of this concerns the report by one John Reeves here in Florida of his encounter with some strange craft, a robot-like creature and the finding of two pieces of tissue-like paper with strange glyphs on them. The Air Force at MacDill AFB arrived on the scene - and with them was a man with CIA credentials. It was later denied that the CIA had been anywhere within hundreds of miles.

Routine reports were filed by local UFO buffs who were members of the largest UFO organizations (civilian). One of these, based in Tucson, Arizona, made its routine check with the Air Force and learned that the Air Force had not been given a report. In fact, Project Blue Book had

to ask for a report which it did not receive for two weeks. Regulations covering such incidents provide that an immediate report, with priority above all other communications, must be made. If necessary, the international emergency signal is to be used to clear the circuits. It is considered as an emergency of the highest order. I do have a copy of these regulations.

Of my own knowledge, the actual papers that John Reeves relinquished were never seen by the Air Force. The Air Force was furnished with rather good copies and based its findings upon analysis of these fakes.

This is just one example of the kind of thing that has taken every bit of time I could spare for so long. My concern has never been with trying to prove whether or not there is such a thing as a flying saucer. That is for others to do if they feel the need. But I am increasingly disturbed by the fraudulent manipulation of fact by those agencies upon whom we should be able to rely for security and a semblance of veracity. It became more frightening when I found I had sufficient evidence to support the belief that whoever is actually running this country has its own air force, consisting of unmarked jet fighters and helicopters and which fly at will any place and any time with no questions. None of the known military services claims responsibility when these craft are seen.

Why is it felt necessary to maintain this anonymous air force - and the very numbers of craft observed in the air at one time is amazing. Where are they based? They are never reported as having been observed on the ground so the conventional bases must be ruled out. And these are the conventional air craft, nothing so exotic as descriptions of UFOs.

So far as I could discover, there was only one agency of our government that could finance and administer such an air force. There is but one that is able to request and receive finances in any amount, only one that does not have to answer to anyone.

This concept was very frightening to me, as it was to my colleagues when I became brave enough to mention it. The implications are terrifying. We have long been aware that our telephones are no more private than commercial radio would be and that our mail is subject to constant scrutiny. I will not forget very easily the first time I mentioned my conclusions in a letter. I received no mail for six months except for bills, notices, publications, a birthday card from my mother and the necessary correspondence pertaining to arranging for a lecture by two people and this latter was permitted only because we stated intent, via telephone, to set up a routing system to insure this correspondence.

When you have the opportunity, ask Penn Jones, Jr., what took place when he was our guest on Bob Ruark's program last Monday night. I would like to know what happened at his end. From our end one moment he was there and the next he was not there, with no indication of the connection's having been broken. Two attempts to re-establish the connection resulted in a recorded message intended to create the belief that the number being called was wrong. After Bob Ruark informed the operator that it was the same number he had used the first time the call went through, Jones was heard loud and clear but dropped to unreadable. A last connection brought him in loud until Bob Ruark repeated the question Jones had missed, at which time he dropped off to very faint.

I did not mention UFOs in my first letter because I believe that neither

that controversy nor the one over the assassination will benefit by being linked. On the radio I am known as "The UFO Lady" and perhaps it signifies something that I am also able to speak on the air to the topic of the Warren fantasy and not hear any reference from callers to UFOs. There was one exception in the beginning but it has never been repeated, even by that person, and I don't anticipate it in the future.

Jim Garrison was magnificent on the Johnny Carson show. A lesser man would have reacted adversely but he came across loud, clear and cool. Poor Johnny. He appeared rather desperate almost before things began. I think he must have convinced the brass that he could handle things if they would not insist on having a legal type present.

One of these fine days, after all the dust has settled, it is my hope and prayer that it will be possible for the people of this country to express, openly, their gratitude to the brave and courageous men who make it possible to speak openly - men like Jim Garrison; Penn Jones, Jr.; and, not least, Harold Weisberg.

Whenever I think of Jim Garrison I am reminded of the movie, "High Noon". I consider all those who will benefit if he is successful, those who hope he will be successful, and those who hide behind conformity and a fear of speaking their minds. And when he is successful, these same rabbits will come from their hiding places to try to share the accolades.

This letter is far too long to send to someone with the limited time you have. But if I don't send it as is, there will be another long delay. I'm sorry to have imposed to this extent and thank you if you are still with me.

My very best to you and your wife.

Sincerely,



Helen G. Hartmann